[4.]

THE Presbyterians Loyalty, AND ZEAL for RELIGION, Briefly Demonstrated: In a LETTER,

By way of Reply to a late Fanatical Pamphlet, Intituled;

The Knave Uncloak'd; or, *The Jesuit in its Colours.*

Shewing how industriously our Modern *Rumpers* endeavour, under the name of *Protestants*, to promote the *Good Old Cause.*

Also proving *Presbyterians* to be *Schismaticks*, and *Bishops Jure Divino* superior to *Presbyters.*

Together with a serious and seasonable Advertisement to all True and Loyal *Protestants.*

There is a Generation that are pure in their own thoughts, and yet are not washed from their filthiness. Prov. 30. 12.

Presumptuous they are, self-willed, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities. 2 Pet. 2. 10.

Men that introduce prophaneness, are cloak'd over with a name of imaginary Religion. *Prosper. lib. 2. de contemptu vitæ, cap. 4.*

Printed in the Year 1680.

THE Presbyterians Loyalty AND ZEAL for RELIGION Demonstrated, &c.

Good Sir Presbyter,

YOur Letter I received, and have hitherto deferr'd to send you a reply, as well because I could not certainly tell where to direct it, as also because I thought it altogether needless to spend any time in answering such frivolous *impertinencies*, and idle *whimseys*; yet forasmuch as the Wise-man adviseth us *to answer the fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit*, *Prov.* 26. 5. I concluded at last to send you these ensuing Lines as a *New-years-Gift*, and direct them to your *Worship* at *Billingsgate*, where I judge by your *dexterity* in scolding and railing *Rhetorick* you are a *Master of Art*, if not *Chair-man* to that quick-tongu'd and unsociable Society.

Truly, to be railed at by the *Presbyterians*, is so far from giving me the least distaste, that I count it the greatest honour they can place upon me, it being now the common Character of a faithful *Patriot*, and true *Loyalist*: And had I been in the least prais'd by such factious Spirits, I would undoubtedly suspect my own actions, and say with *Socrates*, *What evil have I done, that these* Antimonarchical Levellers *should commend me?*

'Tis true, you pretend to be a Son of the *Church* of *England*, and to colour your *knavery*, you most unfortunately make a Cloak of that holy *Church*, whose candour and sincerity is so *transparent*, that your

pernicious designs are plainly seen through it, to the utter confusion of such *hypocritical dissemblers*.

But since the world knows, a *Protestant Jesuit* can equivocate as well as the *Puritan Papist*, I think we have reason enough to believe, that by the *Church* of *England* you mean nothing else but your own *Presbyterian Synagogue*, which alone you esteem the true *Church* of *Christ*; for it is evident, a Son of that *Church*, which is now through God's Providence established among us by the Laws of the Land, you cannot pretend to be, unless such a Son as *Nero* was to *Agrippina*, who scrupled not to procure the death of his unfortunate *Mother*, to satisfie his own monstrous voluptuousness.

You undertake to roll *Sysiphus* his Stone, or wash a *Gypsie*, to vindicate the *Presbyterians*, and make us believe they are *harmless Lambs*, though all true Protestants hold them for *ravenous Wolves*, and now apprehend them most dangerous both to *Church* and *State*: yet so pitiful a defence you make in their behalf, that I cannot tell whether the *Church* of *England* has greater reason to detest your *Schismatical* intention, than your own *Synagogue* to curse your *ill-manag'd* undertaking; for since, as the Poet well observed,

Causa patrocinio non bona pejor erit.

What shall become of an ill Cause very ill defended?

But however you fail in the rest, you are sure not to forget the old contrivances of your Predecessors, the *Parliamentarian Rebels*, and their worthy Progenitors, in charging all those with *Popery*, that presum'd to make the least opposition against their bloody *Zeal* for the *Genevesian* Reformation: Which intrigue, as it prov'd most successful to the *treacherous Rumpers*, so it has been no less destructive and pernicious to the *Church of England*; it being one of the chiefest *stratagems*, whereby the Rebels brought our *Royal Martyr* and his truliest Ministers into an odium with the blinded Rabble.

I could instance here several passages of this *Presbyterian policy*, but I shall content my self with two or three, and will begin with one *remarkable* example, which was a *præludium* to all our former distractions, as their present proceedings, if not timely prevented, do infallibly *prognosticate* the like revolutions to be near at hand. In the year 1632. King *Charles* the First, of glorious memory, took a journey into *Scotland*, and thought by degrees to settle there the *English Liturgy*, with its usual Ceremonies; which the *Ring-leaders* of the *Presbyterian Faction* in that *Kingdom* understanding, not only exclaimed against our

our *Liturgy* as *erroneous* and *superſtitious*, but alſo doubted not to traduce his Majeſty for very ſtrong inclinations to the *Religion* of the *Church* of *Rome*. By which contrivance they quickly poſſeſs'd the *ſhort-ſighted Rabble* with ſuch fears and jealouſies, as afterwards broke out into a flame of open *Rebellion*, to the utter ruine and deſtruction both of *King* and *Countrey*. See *Bakers Chronicle*, *Edit. anno* 1674. *page* 473.

And ſo effectual a contrivance was this piece of policy counted by our brave *Machiavilians*, that in *England* alſo in the year 1641, when the Spirit within them mov'd the blind Zealots to joyn with the *Scotch Rebels*, (as it is recorded by the ſame Hiſtorian, *page* 535.) in the dead of the night, the more to terrifie the timorous vulgar, *they us'd to cry in the ſtreets of* London, *That all people ſhould ariſe to their defence, for the King with his Papiſts were coming to fire the City, and cut their throats in their beds. Than which contrivance* (ſaith the Author) *though nothing were more falſe, yet found the effects of truth.* Likewiſe in *Novemb.* 1642 *Vicar*, the Presbyterian Hiſtorian, in his Chronicle, *Part* 1. *page* 212. ſpeaking of the Battle of *Edge-hill*, gives this relation of his holy Brethren, *The Sabbath day after their arrival to* London, *the godly and well-affected Miniſters* (i. e. the Presbyterian Predicants) *throughout the City preached and praiſed the Lord publickly, for their joyful and ſafe return home to their Parents, Maſters, and Friends, exhorting thoſe young Soldiers of Chriſts Army Royal ſtill to retain, and be forward and ready to ſhew their courage and zeal to the defence of Gods Cauſe, and their Countreys welfare: ſhewing them the Plots of their adverſaries, to have introduced Popery and Tyranny into the Kingdom; and aſſuring them, that this War on their parts was waged and managed by Papiſts, an Army of Papiſts being raiſed by the Kings command, contrary to his vows and proteſtations.*

It is needleſs, I ſuppoſe, to repeat here, how often moſt of our eminent *Divines*, and zealous *Church men*, ever ſince the *Reformation*, have been ſlandered in this manner by theſe hot-headed *Enthuſiaſts*, and compelled to make *Apologies* in their own vindication againſt ſuch wicked aſperſions. Was not the Learned Dr. *Mountagne*, Biſhop of *Chichester*, forced to write a Book, intituled, *Appello Cæſarem*, againſt the malicious Calumnies of the *Puritan* Party, where the godly man ſheweth himſelf ſo far from being daunted with their bold attempts and bloody Menaces, that, with true *Chriſtian courage* he openly expoſeth to the world their *myſteries of iniquety*, and fully diſcovereth their pernicious contrivances to undermine our *Church*, and ſubvert our *Government*? and amongſt the reſt, he ſpeaketh in this manner, *The truth is, as with the Jeſuit he is an Heretick, that is not* furioſo *more a Roman Catholick*

Catholick, ſo with the Puritan he is a Papiſt that will not run a madding with them. It is not the firſt time (ſaith he) *for this very cauſe I have been talk'd of, eſteem'd of, traduc'd as a Papiſt; which I can the better brook, becauſe they have meted this meaſure to the Church of England it ſelf, as ſympathiſing with Papiſts in her Liturgy, Diſcipline, and Doctrine.* In his *Appeal to Ceſar, part* 2. *c.* 1. *p.* 110.

All true Proteſtants therefore, who preſer the *Harmonious* and *Apoſtolical Order* and *Government* of the *Church* of *England*, before the confuſed hodge-podge of the new-found *Geneveſian Diſcipline*, have now (I think) ſufficient reaſon to beware of ſuch dangerous contrivances for the future, and not ſuffer themſelves to be gull'd again by ſuch gilded pretences, which, like the *Apples* of *Sodom*, are ſpecious indeed and beautiful without, but baſe and filthy within. The *Presbyterians*, to our ſorrow, have by this policy once deceived us, and the Lord forgive them; but if they deceive us again, then the Lord forgive us. *Improbe Neptunum accuſat, qui iterum naufragium facit.* As for my part, I declare before God and the World, that I renounce with all my heart and Soul as well the *Idolatrous Papiſts*, as the *Anarchical Presbyterians*, whoſe blind zeal and tranſparent hypocriſie, with their appurtenances, *abjuro, denego, deteſtor.*

I muſt confeſs, the Presbyterians are ſomething beyond the Papiſts in matters of *Religion*, neither did I ever compare them together in that point; but I ſuppoſed with the moſt Learned of our *Church*, and particularly with *Englands Solomon*, King *James* of glorious memory, in his *Apology* for the *Oath of Allegiance*, *page* 19. That *Papiſts* were never perſecuted in this *Kingdom* (if not by *Cromwel* and his *Rumpers*) for matters of Faith, but for their wicked Principles, and deſtructive Practices againſt *Temporal Government*. And now I appeal to the judicious Reader, if I have not ſufficiently demonſtrated in my former Paper out of the prime Authors and Founders of the *Geneveſian Goſpel*, as *Calvin, Beza, Knox, Buchanan, &c.* that the Presbyterian Principles are altogether as dangerous and deſtructive, if not more pernicious to *Temporal Government*, than that of the Papiſts themſelves. And if your Anſwer to this be not rather a plain confeſſion of the crime, than any vindication thereof, let the *Reader* judge.

Firſt, you ſay, *I am fain to go into other Countreys, as far as* Scotland *and* Geneva, *to prove the Rebellious Principles of the Presbyterians.* But, *good Sir Presbyter*, is not that enough, or are not the Presbyterians every where of the ſame *ſtamp* and *coine*? And beſides, why may it not be as good a way to prove the Principles of the *Presbyterians*, by alledging the Doctrine of the *Pope* of *Geneva*, and his chief *Incendiarites*,

as

as it is to demonſtrate the Principles of the *Papiſts*, by alledging the Doctrine of the *Pope* of *Rome*, and his approved *Emiſſaries*? But if neither of theſe reaſons be ſufficient in your *phantaſie*, do but peruſe Dr. *Bancroft* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury's Book of dangerous Poſitions*, and there you ſhall find enough even of *Engliſh Presbyterians* (though but Sucklings then) eagerly maintaining this *Anarchical Doctrine*; there you ſhall find a whole Chapter of that particular ſubject, with this Title, *The Doctrine of certain* Engliſh *Miniſters, which they learn'd at* Geneva, *and publiſhed of purpoſe to have procured the like courſe of Reformation in* England *to that in* Scotland. Behold now, *Sir Presbyter*, your *Geneveſian Goſpellers*, and thoſe *Engliſh* too, and *Engliſh* that to promote the *good old Cauſe*, would not ſcruple to deſtroy that antient and *Apoſtolical Hierarchy* of the Church of *England*, and enflame their *Native Countrey* into a total combuſtion of Sedition and Rebellion. But let us ſee whether your ſecond Anſwer be any thing leſs ridiculous or impertinent than the former. *Yet admit* (ſay you) *the Presbyterians in* England *hold the ſame Principles, put the queſtion whether were more Antimonarchical or unſafe to Government, an opinion, that Tyrants and oppoſers of God, might* (propter id) *be oppoſed by their Subjects*, &c. *or that a good King, one of the Reformed Religion, meerly for being ſuch, ſhould be depoſed, dethron'd, and murthered*, &c? But (*good Sir Presbyter*) what is more feaſible, than for a Presbyterian to make a Tyrant of what *Prince* he pleaſes? We ſee now with what dexterity he makes *Papiſts and Penſioners* of the moſt *zealous Proteſtants*, and no leſs *faithful Patriots*; and we have lately ſeen with what *Legerdemain* he made a *Tyrant* of the beſt of *Princes*. What Sovereigu then can be ſecure from theſe Presbyterians, if it lies in their breaſt thus to make him either a *Titus* or a *Nero*, a clement *Prince*, or a cruel *Tyrant*? or can he think himſelf a *Sovereign*, and not rather *Tenant at will* to his own *Anarchical* Subjects? Yet you would fain perſwade us, your holy *Puritans* teach onely, that *Tyrants may be oppoſed by their Subjects*; whereas all the world can tell, how in our own days they have not onely *oppoſed*, but alſo *depoſed, dethron'd, and cruelly murdered*, not a *Tyrant*, but the moſt meek and Religious of *Sovereigns*, and that by a *formality* of Law too; a thing I never heard perpetrated by any Popiſh Subjects ſince the creation of the World, no, not by the moſt barbarous Heathens againſt the worſt of Tyrants.

As for a Kings being of the *Reformed Religion*, we know it ſignifies nothing to the Presbyterian *Zealots*, except he be of the *Geneveſian Doctrine* and *Diſcipline*; the *Church* of *England*, ſay they, *is neither hot nor cold, neither Popiſh nor Reformed*. And therefore in the Year 1648,

when

when the late *King* and *Parliament* were like to agree, the Presbyterian *Incendiaries* exclaimed against such proposals, untill the *Genevesian Discipline* were first established by Law. *This restitution of his Majesty* (say they) *to the exercise of his Royal power, before security had from him for settling Religion, your Lordships know by our eight desires, and otherwise, is conceiv'd by us to be inconsistent with the safety and security of Religion.* —*The bringing of his Majesty to some of his Houses in or near* London, *before satisfaction and security had from him in point of Religion, and in such other things as are necessary for the safety of the Kingdoms, could not* (*as we conceive*) *but be an exceeding great discouragement and offence to the Presbyterians in England, who will conceive that the remedy is worse than the disease.* In the humble Representation of the Commissioners of the General Assembly to the Honourable Estates of Parliament, April the 28. 1648. Likewise, in the year 1649. the *Rebellious-Zealots* would not submit themselves in *Scotland* to their natural *Soveraign*, his present Majesty, except *he would by solemn Oath under his hand and seal, allow the National Covenant of* Scotland, *and the Solemn League and Covenant of* Scotland, England, *and* Ireland, *and would prosecute the ends thereof in his Royal station.* See *Baker's* Chronicle, page 613. Tell me now, Sir *Presbyter*, are not these rare examples of your Presbyterian Loyalty to your natural Princes, and to Princes of the *Protestant Church*, and *Reformed Religion* too? But to set down exactly the true state of the question, admit (as you say, and cannot deny) the Presbyterians of *England* hold the same principles with the *Genevesian-Gospellers*; put you the question now, whether is more *Antimonarchial* or unsafe to *Government*, an *opinion* or rather a *fundamental doctrine*, that *Tyrants* and opposers of God, (*i. e.* any Prince that hinders the *growth* of *Presbyterie*) may *propter id*, be oppos'd, nay, depos'd, dethron'd and cruelly Murder'd by their Subjects, as Presbyterians undeniably hold, and as undeniably have practis'd: or that it is *Heresie* in any *Christian* to affirm, that a *Prince may be slain or depos'd by his Subjects for any disorder or default, either in Life or Government*, as very *Eminent Papists* expressly teach; as (to omit those two *swindging Authorities*, as you call them, of the *Rhemists Commentaries*, and of the *Council of Constance*) it sufficiently appeareth by *Alphons. à Castro, lib de hæres. in verbo* Tyran. *Dominic. à Soto*, lib. 5. *de Just. & Jur.* qu. 1. *art.* 3. and many others.

Now do you if you can, produce such another *Ecclesiastical Assembly* or *Synod*, or such eminent writers of the Presbyterian party, thus declaring it *Impious and Heretical* to believe that Subjects may Lawfully

fully depose or Murder their *Soveraign* upon the account of any Tyranny or *oppression* whatsoever, and you will make the World have a better opinion of your Sect, than ever they had hitherto: otherwise, notwithstanding all your multiplied bablings, we must conclude, *to give the Devil his due*, that in matter of Temporal Government, the principles of the Papists are far Sounder and more *Orthodox*, than the Presbyterian *Catechism*. As for the practises of the one and the other, you tell me, *could I prove my charge against the Presbyterians, as unexceptionably, as you can that of the Plot against the Papists, I would do something indeed.* But I appeal to any man of common sense, if you be not as *unexceptionably* impudent in your bold assertions, as the Presbyterians are notoriously *Treacherous* in their pernicious practices. The bloud of our late *Martyr'd Soveraign*, and the effusion of so much Protestant bloud in the late Civil Wars, (you should say, *Presbyterian Rebellion*) you are so impudent as to plaister it upon the unfortunate Papists, without any colour or shew of proof, (it being plain to all the World, that in the whole List of the *Regicides*, none is to be found but *notorious Presbyterians*) and withall to affirm, that the former are more evidently prov'd guilty of the *present Plot*, than the latter can be convicted of the *Rebellious practices* laid to their charge: whereas on the one side, we have but four or five persons to swear this horrid *conspiracy* against the Papists; but on the other side, all our *Records*, all our *Histories*, nay, our own *memories*, and all the World can testifie the late *Tragical* transactions, as the inhumane Murder of our *Royal Martyr*, the effusion of so much innocent bloud, the burning and pillaging of so many *Cities*, *Towns* and *Pallaces*, and in brief all the *Massacres* that have been committed, all the *Miseries* that have happened in this *Island* of *Great Britain* these 50 years past, to have been wholly and solely perpetrated by these Monsters of *Christianity* the *Anarchical*-Presbyterians, as well *dependent* as *independent*, as well *Scotch* as *English*, the one *beginning*, the other *ending* the *Tragedy*, the one *Selling*, the other *Killing* their *natural Soveraign* to the amazement of all the World.

Oh! how happy would they think themselves now, had these villanies been as private, as the present conspiracy of the Papists? Had we been trusting to the discovery of Mr. *Oats*, Mr. *Bedlow*, or the rest, concerning these presbyterian treacheries, as well as the Popish Plot; Oh! how boldly the *Puritan-Gospellers* would outface our witnesses? with what black colours they would paint them, to extenuate the credibility of their informations? So far they would think the charge from being unexceptionably proved against them, that they would not

doubt but they might easily perswade the World, nothing could be more unreasonable, than to believe it upon the credit of such inconsiderable witnesses, tho' now against the Papists they hold them for *Delphian Oracles*. "What! (would they say) can it be Law, equity, or conscience, to take the oaths of some few despicable fellows, very obnoxious "to be suspected of malice and corruption, against the lives of good and "peaceable Subjects, men of worth and known integrity? to take the "oaths of living Vagabonds, before the protestations of dying Christians? who can be safe, if this be admitted? or if this be justice, what "can be term'd injustice amongst us?

In this manner, we may be sure, or rather in far higher terms, would our *Supersanctified-Hypocrites* rail against these very Persons, they now so much adore for Swearing against the Papists, had their crimes been so occult as to need a discoverer; and these, nay, people of greater credit, and much less obnoxious to exception, had come in to reveal their *Mysteries* of iniquity. The title of *His Majesties Evidence* could not in the least protect them from the snarling invectives of a Presbyterian. All that Papists now say of them, signified nothing to what the Presbyterians would then vomit against them. Witness their usage of Mr. *Willoughby*, alias *Dangerfield*, &c. who when he pretended to discover a Presbyterian Plot, was presently proclaim'd in the *Weekly Intelligences* and other *Pamphlets*, the greatest Knave and Villain upon Earth, and called *Knight* of the Post, *Newgate-Bird*, and such other titles of *Honour*, nay, affirmed to have been actually upon the *Pillory* for his misdemeanours. The Title of *His Majesties Evidence*, or his pretending to witness for the *King*, could nothing avail him against these *Sanctified* creatures, tho' now he is reputed among them an *Holy Proselyte* newly inspir'd and illuminated by the Lord. 'Tis true, he gave them (as himself confesses) but false informations against the Presbyterians, being put on that design either by the Popish party to turn the Plot upon their adversaries, or by some Presbyterian *Politicians* to gain the greater credit to their new Informer, or perhaps by himself to gain such maintenance and allowance for the future, as may keep him henceforth from the tryed punishments of the *Pillory*, seeing those of the trade do thrive so well. There are now in the World a great number of *Foolhardy Desperadoes*, of no Fortune, but less Honesty, who think their only way to Preferment is, to run upon *desperate courses*, and rather than fail of an *Advancement*, to venture *Neck and all* for a Livelihood, according to that witty saying of the Satyrist:

Aude aliquid brevibus Gyaris, aut carcere dignum,
Si vis esse aliquid; probitas laudatur & alget.

For

For as *Virgil* saith, ——— *Quid non mortalia pectora cogis Auri sacra fames?* ——— In St. *Pauls* days, Godliness was great Gain; but to these, Gain is great Godliness: of whom we may justly say with the Poet,

Unde habeat quaerit nemo, sed oportet habere.

As for Mr. *Dangerfield*, this only I say, altho' he gave but false Informations against the Presbyterians, yet this was not then known to the generality of the people; and tho' it is undeniable, that such a Plot might well be carried on by the Ring-leaders of that Faction, without communicating it to the Vulgar; nevertheless the *Puritan-Rabble* did so bark and snarl at *Dangerfield*, as if they had known by *Revelation* there was no such Plot at all.

But to return from this digression to our intended purpose, since reason comands us to prefer the unanimous consent of the greatest and ablest men of our *Country*, together with all our *Histories* and *Records*, and our own *experimental knowledg*, before the oaths of four or five persons, tho' never so upright in their lives, or so positive and exact in their informations; and *a fortiori*, of people not so qualified, but obnoxious to several exceptions and suspicious circumstances, which mightily weakens their evidence, and leaves many judicious men in suspence, frustrated of their expected satisfaction of having the Plot clear'd beyond all exception: surely, we cannot but conclude the late *Rebellion* to be far more *unexceptionably* prov'd against the Presbyterians, than the present Plot against the Papists. Not that I would in the least vindicate the *Romanists* from those horrid crimes laid to their charge, for I am fully satisfied they are as apt to commit any villany to advance their *Superstitions*, as the Presbyterians are to promote *the Good old cause*; but to shew that the late *Hellish Rebellion* of the one, is far more undeniable than the present *Conspiracy* of the other.

And if your own *Conscience* did not accuse you of the known verity of this assertion, or if you thought the *Presbyterians* have not really committed these Hellish abominations objected against them, to what purpose did you set the Act of *Oblivion*, to bring up the rear of your ridiculous *Apology?* Surely, things that never have been, could not have been forgotten. *Oblivio est preteritorum.* Yet you very confidently bid me *read over the several Tryals, and other pieces extant by Authority, concerning the present Plot, and see whether it be Presbyterians or Papists that murdered Sir* Edmundbury Godfrey, *that hired the Ruffians to murder his Sacred Majesty, and to ruine both Church and State.* But I desire you to read over the late *Narratives* of the *Rebellion* in *Scotland*, and see whether Presbyterians or Papists murdered the good

Bishop of St. *Andrews*; read over likewise the *History* of the late *Rebellion* in *England*, and see whether it be Presbyterians or Papists, that have (not hired *Ruffians* to murder, but themselves like inhumane *Traytors*, actually) murder'd our late *Soveraign*, and totally ruin'd both *Church* and *State*: and then see what you can get by the bargain, but that notwithstanding your ridiculous *Apology* the Presbyterians are still worse than the Papists, whereas the one did but design, the other have actually compleated our ruine. You tell us for strange news, they are not concern'd in the present *Plot*; and very strange it is indeed, that there should be any Plot or Conspiracy in this *Kingdom*, whereof the Presbyterians should nor be the chief *Engineers*. Yet, Sir *Presbyter*, in my opinion you have no great reason to brag of your Brethrens innocence of this Popish Plot, since the world knows, they have commited greater villanies, and that in the face of the Sun, and for *Religion* too. Besides, I advise you to observe the common saying, *Lauda finem*, and tho' your *mysteries* of iniquity be not yet revealed, yet beware least before the present discovery be at an end, your Presbyterians be not found as deeply concern'd, as any Papist alive, either in this, or in another Plot of their own: for how can it be thought, that such *Politick* and active *Machiavels* should let this occasion slip, or omit the fairest opportunity they could expect of overthrowing their greatest adversaries, the one as *Idolatrous* Papists, the other either as *Popishly* inclined, or as introducers of *Tyranical* and *Arbitrary Government*? I omit here, that I have seen several reasons and arguments, very specious indeed to outward appearance, strongly insinuating that the Presbyterians are the *primum mobile* even of the present Plot, and the chief, if not the sole contrivers of all these troubles, fraudulently corrupting and suborning most of those witnesses, that came in to swear against tha Papists, purposely to draw the *Kingdom* into a confusion, and thereby restore the *Cromwellian Gospel* and *Government*.

In this assertion, I know, there is no *impossibility* or *contradiction* to be found; I believe it very *feasible* (and without doubt it has been often done) to corrupt and suborn men of better credit and reputation than these witnesses have been, that have yet appeared in this discovery; and withall I am sure, the Presbyterians are too apt to commit any villany to promote the *Good old cause*: yet nevertheless, because we must not insist upon unprov'd, tho' probable suspicions, when we have enough even of plain demonstrations to prove our intended purpose of shewing how dangerous our *Puritan-Clergy*, if not prudently and timely prevented, are to our *Church* and [illegible] probability of this charge, I leave to be weigh'd and examined by the judicious Reader.

In

In the interim, tell me I beſeech you, what may be the reaſon that the Presbyterians are the activeſt and moſt eager proſecutors of the Papiſts upon the account of this Plot, and alſo the greateſt promoters and admirers of thoſe witneſſes, that appear againſt them. Are the Presbyterians the ableſt men in the *Kingdom?* or do they only apprehend the danger of this Plot? Do they love their *Religion*, *Lives*, or *Liberties*, better than Proteſtants love theirs? or were not Proteſtants to be made away, had this Plot gon on, as well as the Presbyterians? why then are not the latter as moderate as the former, or the former as mad as the latter? Truly, I have heard ſeveral *Judicious Proteſtants* affirm, they could never believe, that the Presbyterians ſhould be ſo hot or eager in proſecuting this Popiſh Plot againſt ſo inconſiderable a party, as Papiſts now are in this *Kingdom*, except they had greater deſigns, or were more concerned in that Plot themſelves, than they would have the *World* believe. But time will tell truth.

Your ignorance tells you, I have affronted the *Clergy* of the *Church* of *England*, by calling them *Dumb-dogs*; but you ſhould know before you appeared in Print, that a *Dog*, for his natural vigilancy, is the common *Emblem* of an *Eccleſiaſtical Paſtor*; and if our *Prelates* now be leſs active than is neceſſary for to prevent your *Treacherous* deſigns, and countermine your *pernicious* contrivances againſt their Flock, they may attribute this application of *Gods word*, *Iſa.* 56. 10. not to any ill meaning of mine, but rather to their own unreaſonable careleſneſs in ſuch a deſperate juncture of times, when our greateſt, if not our only enemies, the Presbyterians and Papiſts, are equally, tho' ſeverally, bent for our deſtruction; *thoſe brethren in evil*, (as the Biſhop of *Chichester* elegantly calls them) *who looking and running two ſeveral ways, do like* Samſon's Foxes *joyn together in the taile.* in his appeal to *Ceſar*, part 1. c. 4. p. 48.

Here I ſhall beg the favour of you, to ask that *Reverend Prelate*, who declared himſelf in the *Parliament* before the laſt, ſo favourable to your Sect, what does he think now of the Presbyterians, or whether in his opinion they took the *Reverend Biſhop* of St. *Andrews by the Lawn-ſleeves, or by the Throat?* Ask likewiſe the reſt of thoſe learned *Prelates*, whether the Presbyterians have *like waſpiſh Curs bark'd* at that holy man *Archbiſhop Laud*, or *like your red Dragon utterly devoured him?* Is it credible, think you, theſe eminent Divines ſhould be of ſo ſhort a memory, as to forget who ſo lately voted them out of the Houſe of Peers, barbarouſly impriſoned them in the *Tower*, ſequeſtered their Lands and Revenues, (which to an *Engliſhman* is worſe then to loſe his life) deprived them of all power and jurisdiction both Spiritual & Temporal,

and

and in fine, quite abolished the whole order and *hierarchy* of that *Apostolical* Institution? or is it likely they would now *Apologize* for that faction which have lately so *Antichristianly* abused them? they know it is an old and true saying, *Veterem ferendo injuriam, invitas novam*: and I pray God, they may not find it verified in themselves, who through their excesive meekness and patience towards these ungrateful miscreants, I am afraid, will encourage them once more to attempt the suppressing of this *Apostolical hierarchy*; which we may plainly read in their libells and pamphlets, is their main design. Yet notwithstanding this, and all other eminent dangers, which daily threaten us from the Presbyterian party, you are so impudent, as to term your self an *Episcopal* Protestant, and yet strain your empty noddle in apologizing for these *Antiepiscopal* Sectaries, and excusing their *Schismatical* separation from the *Mother Church*, thereby encouraging them to act over again their horrid villanies of 48. and sing the second part to the same tune.

You tell us forsooth, *they are our fellow-protestants, and therefore not to be reputed as enemies to our Church, but to be embraced as brethren of our Reformation.* Protestants, 'tis true, they stile themselves, but false ones they are always reputed by our Church, as Papists are false *Christians*; for (as the Apostle saith) *they are not all Israel, which are of Israel*, *Rom.* 9. 6. Neither are they all Protestants, which are called Protestants; many do love the name, but hate the thing: and therfore why should not false *Protestants* be thought as dangerous to the true faith and worship of God, as false *Christians*, I could never yet understand. Papists are but false *Christians*, but the Presbyterians are false *Protestants*, and by consequence they are false *Christians* too: why then should the one be counted our Brethren, and the other our Enemies? or what can we gain by this our ill-bestowed kindness to the presbyterians, but to draw upon us the charge of all their monstrous contrivances, and make our selves accountable for their wickedness, as the papists are now commonly charged with the horrid practices of the *Jesuits*? Do not we see how as the *Primitive Christians* were grievously slandered, and most vehemently hated by the *Heathens*, because of the multiplied villanies of the *Gnosticks* and other prophane Sects of those times, that professed *Christianity*; so true Protestants now are obnoxious to those manifold calumnies unjustly heaped by the Papists and other Sectaries, upon our *Church* and Doctrine, and the whole *Reformation*, because of the seditious practices and wicked treacheries of the Presbyterian party, who commonly stile themselves *Protestants* and *Reformed*, yea, *Refined Christians*? Nay, I do verily believe, that as the monstrous wickedness

neſs of the aforeſaid *Heretick* was then a great bar to the timely converſion of the *Idolatrous Pagans*; ſo now the *unchriſtian* proceedings of the presbyterians do mainly obſtruct the *Papiſts* from receiving the true light of the *Goſpel*.

O, but they are our weak Brethren, and we muſt bear their infirmities. Weak Brethren, ſay you? I pray God keep them ſo, and grant they be never ſtronger to ruine our *Church* and *State*, as formerly they have done. Now the *Phariſaical Hypocrites* alledge the weakneſs and tenderneſs of their Conſciences for this *Schiſmatical* diſobedience to their lawful Paſtors, and ſeparation from the *Mother-Church*; though in 48 no tenderneſs of Conſcience could hinder them from murdering their natural *Sovereign* in *England*, and in 79 their onely *Primate* and *Metropolitane* in *Scotland*. *O blind Guides*, (as our Saviour ſaid of the Phariſees) *which ſtrain at a gnat, and ſwallow a camel*, *Matth.* 23. 34. Yet theſe blind Hypocrites you muſt hall in amongſt Epiſcopal Proteſtants, and under the ridiculous name of *diſſenting Brethren*, you endeavour to foſter ſuch *Vipers* in the boſom of our *Church*; a name ſo ſtrange and ſelf-contradictory, as if we had called them our *odious Lovers*, our *loving Enemies*, or the like; for if the Presbyterians obſtinately diſſent from our *Church* in Communion, or matters of Religion, as undoubtedly they do, how can they be our Brethren? or if they be our Brethren in *Religion*, how can they differ from us in Communion, or matters of Faith, which eſſentially is one and individual? for, as the Apoſtle teſtifieth, there is but *one Lord*, *one Faith*, *one Baptiſm*, *Epheſ* 4. 5.

Ay, but they do not diſſent from us as much as the Papiſts do, not in ſo many, nor in ſo neceſſary points of Religion. But this is to no purpoſe; firſt, becauſe *Heathens* diſſent from us more than *Jews*, *Jews* than *Turks*, and *Turks* than *Papiſts*; yet we muſt embrace neither *Jew*, *Turk*, nor *Papiſt*, for our diſſenting Brethren in *Religion*. Secondly, Becauſe even as it is nothing material whether a man dies of one mortal wound, or of twenty; ſo it ſkilleth not whether a *Chriſtian* obſtinately erres in one neceſſary point of Religion, or in a dozen. For it is in the Chriſtian Religion, as St. *James* ſaith of the Law, *Whoſoever offendeth in one point, he is guilty of all*, *James* 2. 10. Now it is evident to all the world, that the Presbyterians groſly err in three of the chiefeſt Pillars of *Chriſtian Religion*, as *Charity*, *Unity*, and *Obedience*: It cannot therefore avail them much that they agree with us in ſo many points of the Superſtructure, while they diſagree from us in the very Foundation. Hear what St. *Auguſtin* ſaith of the *Donatiſts* in *Africk*, who much reſemble the *Presbyterians* in *England*; *In many things*

things (saith he) *they are with me, in few not with me; but in these few wherein they are not with me, the many things wherein they are with me do nothing avail them*; in *Psal.* 54. *ver.* 19. Thirdly because all true *Protestants* acknowledge the Presbyterians are *schismaticaly* separated from the *Church* of *England*, as well as the Papists; and on the other side, in the *sentiments* of all Learned *Divines*, both antient and modern, *Schism* is so heinous a wickedness, that without repentance and reunion with the *Church* (unless perhaps invincible ignorance may lessen the crime) it wholly excludes the Party from *eternal salvation*, according to the express words of our Saviour, *If he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man, and a Publican*, Matth. 18. 17. *There cannot possibly* (saith St. *Irenæus*) *be made any reformation of such importance, as the mischief of Schism is pernicious*, lib. 4. c. 62. For (as *Dionysius Alexandrinus* testifieth) *It is a more grievous wickedness to divide the Church, than to sacrifice to Idols*, ap. *Euseb.* lib. 6 *hist.* c. 37. Which is yet further affirmed by the Prince of Divines, the great St. *Augustine*, *The sacrilege of Schism* (saith he) *surpasseth all wickedness*, lib. 1. *contra ep. Parmen.* c. 4. And lest we should not believe his own single testimony, this assertion he solidly confirms by the fearful punishment inflicted on *Corah*, *Dathan*, and *Abiram*, for their *schismatical* disobedience to *Moses* and *Aaron*. *At what time* (saith he) *God would teach his People by new and fresh punishments to beware of their former transgressions, when an Idol was made and adored*, (Exod. 32.) *when the Prophets book was burnt by the hasty King*, (Jer. 36.) *and the schism was attempted* (Numb. 16.) *by* Corah and his accomplices; *the Idolatry was punished with the sword, the burning of the book was revenged with wasting War and forreign Captivity; but the Schism was plagued with the sudden gaping of the earth, the Authors thereof having been swallowed up alive, and consum'd with fire from heaven. Who now* (saith this great Logician) *will doubt, but that was most wickedly committed, which was most grievously punished?* lib. 2. *de Bapt. cont. Donatist.* c. 6.

St. *Cyprian* goeth yet further, and of all *schismatical* Separatists, giveth this general sentence, *Such people, though they were killed in the confession of Christs name, yet that blemish even by blood is not washed away; the unpardonable and grievous crime of dissention is not purged even with death. He cannot be a Martyr that is not in the Church. He cannot attain to the Kingdom, that forsakes her which is to reign. Such an one may be killed, but cannot be crown'd. The enemy of the Altar, rebellious against the Sacrifice of Christ*, despising the Bishops, and forsaking the Priests of God, *presumes to erect another Altar, and make other prayers by his unlawful speeches.* Lib. *de Unit. Eccles.*

Neither

Neither are our *Modern Divines* leſs plain in this particular; and to begin with *Calvin*, the great God of the Presbyterians, he gives his verdict in theſe following words. *We profeſs the unity of the Church (ſuch as is deſcribed by St.* Paul) *to be moſt dear unto us; and we accurſe them that ſhall any thing violate it*; lib. de neceſs. Reform. Eccleſ. And again, *The Lord doth ſo highly eſteem the Communion of his Church, that he holds him for an Apoſtate, and deſerter of Religion, who inſolently ſeparates himſelf from any Chriſtian Society, ſo it be ſuch a one as hath the true Miniſtry of the Word and Sacraments*; lib. 4. Inſtit. c. 1. §. 10. Either therefore we have not the true Miniſtry of the Word and Sacraments in the Church of *England*, or elſe the Presbyterians are Schiſmaticks, nay Apoſtates and deſerters of Religion, even in the Judgment of their own Patriarch *Calvin*.

Luther likewiſe in his explication upon the *Creed*, ſpeaks to the ſame purpoſe: *Neither* Gentile, *nor* Jew, (ſaith he) *Heretick, or any other ſinner, is ſaved, unleſs he make Atonement with the Church, and in all things think, do, and teach the ſame.* As for our own *Divines*, they are in this point both plain and poſitive: *It is falſe* (ſaith our Learned *Whitaker*) *that Heretical and Schiſmatical Churches, are true Churches.* controv. 2. q. 5. c. 9. And again: *Whereas he proves, that Hereticks, Apoſtates, and Shiſmaticks are not Members of the true Church, it is nothing to us; for this none of us ever affirmed.* controv. 2. q. 1. c. 4.

And Dr. *Fulk* in his Treatiſe of the Succeſſion of the *Church*, p. 390. ſaith: *What ſkilleth it, whether one being drawn by Hereſie or Schiſm from the Body of Chriſt, be ſubject to Eternal Damnation?*

Mr. *Caſaubone* alſo in his Letter to Cardinal *Peron*, written by the appointment of King *James*, page 8. thus ſaith: *The King doth condemn and deteſt thoſe, who departed either from the faith of the Catholick Church, and became Hereticks; or from her Communion, and became Schiſmaticks.* And the ſame is taught by Dr. *Humphrey*, ad rat. 3. Campiani. p. 207. by *Field*, lib. 1. de Eccleſ. c. 7. Confeſs. Helvet. art. 17. Bulling. in compend. fidei. lib. 6. c. 11. Muſculus in Locis, tit. de Schiſmate, p. 621. and many others.

Is it not evident therefore by the unanimous conſent of ſo many *Proteſtant Divines*, ſo exactly concurring with the general vote of the Ancient Writers, and Gods expreſs word, that Schiſm is ſo capital a crime, that it cuts off the party from the *Church* of *God*, and thereby from all ordinary means of obtaining eternal Salvation? And is it not likewiſe certain, that Proteſtants and Presbyterians (notwithſtanding your ridiculous cementing of them together) do mutually cenſure and charge each other with *Schiſm*, if not with impious and *Heretical*

Doctrines. None I think, can be so ignorant, as not to know what a Cloud of Writers have given their verdict on both sides in this particular. To the end therefore you may not hereafter exclaim against me, or alledge that I make it my business to breed dissention and division between *Protestants*, by calling the Presbyterians *Schismatical Sectaries*, (tho' indeed it is my design to seperate the *Wheat* from the *Tares*, true *Protestants* from counterfeit *Religionaries*, and warn them not to trust again such *Hypocritical* Dissemblers) and that you may be convinc'd, this is no particular opinion of mine, but the general tenet of our Learned *Divines*; hear some of them speak their own minds at a time, when Presbytery was not near so monstrous in it self, nor yet half so dangerous or formidable to our *Church*, as it is at present. *The Puritans* (saith Dr. *Bancroft*, *Archbishop* of *Canterbury*) *do pervert the true meaning both of Scripture and Fathers, to serve their own turns.* In his Survey of the pretended Holy Discipline, c. 5. &c.

And Mr. *Parkes*, in his book dedicated to the *Archbishop*, in his *Epistle Dedicatory*, thus saith of your holy Brethren: *They are headstrong, and hardened in error; they strike at the main points of faith, and shaking the foundation it self, and calling into question Heaven and Hell, the Divinity and Humanity, yea the very Soul and Salvation of our Saviour himself.* And again, ibid. *The Puritans have Pestilent Heresies, they are Heretical and Sacrilegious.*

Mr. *Powel* likewise, in his Considerations, saith of them: *They are notorious and manifest Schismaticks, cut off from the Church of God.*

And this is further confirmed by Mr. *Casaubons* excellent Rule, (taken out of S. *Cyprian's* 69. Ep.) in Exercit. 15. contra Baron. nu. 6. Where he saith: *It is an undoubted verity, that whensoever the pious People adheres to their true and lawful Bishop, they are Gods Church; insomuch that whosoever seperates himself from this Congregation, it cannot be doubted, but that he is not in the Church.* Presbyterians therefore are not in the *Church* of God, who have *Schismatically* seperated themselves from the pious and orthodox Protestants adhering to their true and lawful *Bishops*. To be brief, the *Bishop* of *Chichester* gives us a full and short description of these Holy and Sanctified Brethren: I *must confess* (saith he) *my dissent through and sincere from the faction of Novelizing Puritans; men intractible, insociable, incompliable with those that will not* ædificare ad dissensiones; *but in no one point more, than in their desperate doctrine of Predestination*; in his Appeal to *Cæsar*, page 60. And again p. 520. he speaks to the Presbyterians themselves in this manner: *I go no farther, but leave you to your selves, and* (if pos-

sible)

ſible) unto more charitable conceits of thoſe that deſerve no other imputation, but, they are no Puritans: Which God of his Goodneſs keep out of this Church and State, as dangerous as Popery, for any thing I am able to diſcern: The only difference being, Popery is for Tyranny, Puritaniſm for Anarchy; Popery is original of Superſtition, Puritaniſm the Highway unto Prophaneneſs; both alike Enemies to Piety.

But leſt you ſhould think this learned Prelate any thing tranſported with prejudice or partiality in this his cenſure of your Sanctified Brethren, hear what your own Patriarch and firſt founder ſpeaketh of thoſe, who had the firſt Fruits of his Spirit, his holy Proſelytes at *Geneva*: *It is certain* (ſaith he) *that a man ſhall not ſee ſo horrible monſters in the Papacy, as where the Goſpel is Preach'd and Profeſs'd; for they will ſay they are reformed, and yet they ſeem to be Devils incarnate, neither have we need to go far off to find ſuch ſights.* Calvin ſerm. 10. in ep. ad Epheſ.

Now the Presbyterians on the other ſide are nothing behind in ſlandering and charging the Church of *England* with all imaginable corruption; *Schiſm*, they think, is too ſmall a crime to be alledg'd againſt her, whilſt Popiſh *Superſtition* and the dregs of *Antichriſt* do compoſe the chiefeſt part of her Liturgy, Doctrine and Government. *The form of the Communion-Book* (ſay they) *is taken from the Church of Antichriſt; as the reading of the Epiſtles and Goſpels*, &c. *the moſt of the Prayers, the manner of adminiſtring the Sacraments*, &c. in Dr. *Whitgifts* defence, p. 474. And in their Book intituled, The Petition of 22. Preachers in *London*, they ſayn *In the Communion-Book there be things of which there is no ſenſe, there is contradiction in it, even of neceſſary and eſſential points of Religion.* And alſo in their Book of Cannons and Conſtitutions Eccleſiaſtical, printed *Anno* 1604. they ſay: *The worſhip in the Church of* England *is corrupt, ſuperſtitious, unlawfull and repugnant to the Scriptures.* Likewiſe the great Presbyterian *Alexander Henderſon*, in his firſt *Paper* to our *Royal Martyr*, in the Book intituled *Reliquiæ Carolinæ*, part 1. p. 314. thus ſpeaketh: *It is too well known that the Reformation of* K. Henry 8. *was moſt imperfect in the eſſentials of Doctrine, Worſhip and Government*: *And though it proceeded by ſome degrees afterwards, yet the Government was never reformed, the head was changed*, Dominus non Dominium, *and the whole limbs of the Antichriſtian Hierarchy retained. And for this cauſe* (as our late *Sovereign* well obſerves) *their zealous Superſtition thinks or pretends, they cannot do God and the Church a greater ſervice, than utterly to deſtroy that Primitive, Apoſtolical, and anciently univerſal Government of the Church by Biſhops*; in his Eikon Baſilike, c. 9. But to conclude, and if Sy-

metry may tell us the true ſtature of a man by the proportion of his foot, ſurely we may eaſily gueſs what ſenſe the Presbyterians have of thoſe of our *Church*, by that prodigious Sermon of *David Blake*, a *Ring-leader* of the *Kirk* of *Scotland*, who in the year 1596. ſolemnly preached, *That all Kings were the Devils Barns, that King* James *his heart was treacherous, and that the Devil was in the Court, and the Guiders of it; that Queen* Elizabeth *was an Atheiſt, and a wicked Woman; that the Nobility and Lords were miſcreants, bribers, degenerated, godleſs, diſſemblers, and enemies to the Church*, &c. And yet this moſt *ſeditious* and *Anarchical* Sermon was ſo far from being cenſured by the *holy Synagogue* of the Presbyterians, that they openly told King *James*, *It was Gods cauſe, and they muſt protect and defend him to the hazard of their lives*. See *Spotiſwood*'s Hiſtory of the *Church* of *Scotland*, *page* 423, &c.

Speak now, *Sir Presbyter*, and tell us plainly your opinion of your holy diſſenting Brethren; can you defend their going out of the *Church of England* from the brand of Schiſm? Is it not the infallible Badge of Sectaries, to depart from the Communion of Orthox Chriſtians? Obſerve what the beloved Diſciple ſaith, *They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us.* 1 *Joh.* 2. 19. Who therefore is to be eſteemed in your judgment the greateſt *Schiſmatick*, the *Church* of *England*, for not complying with the Presbyterians pretended refining of the *Reformation*, or the Presbyterian *Synagogue* for not obeying the *Church* of *England*, and their lawful *Biſhops*? For undoubtedly, in this Separation, and mutual exclaiming againſt each other, either Party muſt unavoidably be guilty of *Schiſm*; otherwiſe we muſt confeſs, the *Novatians*, *Aerians*, *Luciferians*, and *Donatiſts*, to to have been moſt unjuſtly reputed *Schiſmaticks* by the antient Writers. Do not we know, that one of the chiefeſt points for which *Aerius* was anathematized even for an *Hereſiark* by the *Primitive Church*, was his aſſerting the Parity or Equality of *Biſhops* and *Presbyters*? as St. *Auguſtine* recordeth, *Her.* 53. and as St. *Epiphanius*, *Her.* 75. teſtifieth, and fully confuteth. And yet this very Doctrine is now the *Characteriſtical* note and badge of our holy Puritans. How then can *Aerius* be condemned for a wicked Noveliſt, and theſe his followers be extolled for refining *Reformiſts*? Can the ſame Doctrine be accounted *Orthodox* in the one, and *Heretical* in the other? or muſt we ſay, that of all Antiquity *Aerius* alone did ſee the truth, and all the reſt were blind?

Be not deceived, good Presbyterians, but conſider with your ſelves, whether

whether it be agreeable to ſenſe or reaſon, that a ſingle opinion of a private Upſtart, grounded upon no expreſs Text of Scripture, ſhould be preferred before the unanimous conſent of all *Orthodox* Antiquity, and the whole *Church* of *Chriſt*, at that time eſpecially, when all the world acknowledgeth her to have been in her greateſt ſplendor and purity. Stand not blind-folded with prejudice or partiality, and ſuffer not your ſelves to be tranſported with any prepoſterous zeal or animoſity, which will but obnubilate your underſtanding, and weaken your judgment; but rather examine with a ſober and unbyaſs'd mind the grounds and motives of your Separation from your lawful Superiours and Paſtors, and conſider impartially, whether it be not more reaſonable for Chriſtians to follow the Doctrine of the moſt learned and holy Doctors of the *Primitive Church*, (who have undoubtedly *followed the Lamb*, and are now glorifi'd in *Heaven*) than the new found opinion and groundleſs aſſertion, either of *Aerius*, or his late ſticklers, *John Calvin* and his *Geneveſian Goſpellers*. Remember how the Lord ſaith, *Stand ye in the ways, and ſee, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye ſhall find reſt for your ſouls, Jer. 6. 16.* And this *reſt*, if you expect to enjoy, forſake not the antient form of *Church-Government*, which has continued in *Chriſts Church* ſince the Apoſtles time. *Sæpe viatorem nova, non vetus orbita fallit.* Can you find in all Antiquity one *Orthodox Chriſtian* aſſerting, or one faithful *Church* exerciſing this your Presbyterian Diſcipline? Do not all *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtories* tell us, how Chriſts Church, ſince his Aſcenſion, has been always governed by Biſhops? Was not St. *Auguſtine* Biſhop of *Hippo* in *Affrick*, St. *Ambroſe* of *Millan*, St. *Hillary* of *Poictiers*, St. *Cyprian* of *Carthage*, St. *Chryſoſtom* of *Conſtantinople*, St. *Athanaſius* of *Alexandria*, St. *Irenæus* of *Lyons*; and, in a word, were not the moſt eminent *Eccleſiaſtical Worthies*, that flouriſhed ſince the beginning of Chriſtianity, Biſhops of their reſpective Sees or Churches? Did you ever hear of any Society of Chriſtians, ſince the Apoſtles time, governed onely by Presbyters or Elders, not ſubordinate to Epiſcopal Government? Or can you find in all the holy Scriptures one Text to warrant theſe your levelling Principles, of aboliſhing the antient Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy of Chriſts Church? Can you deny, but that until our Saviour's time, there were in the *Jewiſh* Church Chief or High Prieſts, which by God's appointment were Superintendents and Preſidents over the Levites and inferiour Clergy? See 2 *Chron.* 19. 11. *Matth.* 2. 4. *Heb.* 9. 6. And is it not as evident, that in the New Teſtament the Apoſtles were Preſidents and Chief Superintendents, not onely over the Laity of their

their times, but also over all the Deacons, nay over the Priests and Elders of the Church of Christ? Since therefore it is incredible, that this Authority conferr'd by Christ on his Apostles, principally for the good of his Church, should die with their persons, and not rather descend to their Successors, and thereby continue in his Church to the end of the World; it cannot be doubted, but that the Apostles Power and Jurisdiction over Priests and Deacons was invested in others, who, as the Apostles Successors, should govern not onely the Flock, but also the inferiour Pastors and Rulers thereof. Now that Bishops are the lawful Successors of the Apostles in this Spiritual Jurisdiction, may be gathered, first, out of that passage of holy Scripture, where the Apostleship of St. *Matthias* is expressly called *his Bishoprick*, *Acts* 1. 20. thereby insinuating, that Bishops are the same, or at least the next in Authority to the Apostles. 2. It may be confirmed by the universal consent of all antient Writers, unanimously affirming, that Bishops onely have succeeded to the Apostles in the Government of Christs Church. See *Conc. Neocesar. Can.* 13. *Damas. ep.* 3. *de Chorepiscopis. Hiero. ep. ad Marcellam de Erroribus Montani. Aug. in Psal.* 44. *Leo ep.* 88. *Isidor. lib.* 2. *de Divin. Officiis. Beda in c.* 10. *Luc.* and several other antient Writers of the Primitive Church.

But before we lanch further into the Testimonies of these ancient Writers, that we may at once both confirm our own Doctrine, and confound yours, let us see what great proofs you can produce out of holy Scripture or Fathers, either for your Presbyterian, or aganist our Episcopal Government.

First, you say, there is no mention in holy Scripture of a *Bishops* being above a *Presbyter*, therefore no such thing is to be admitted. A rare *Argument* indeed; but what if I say, that your *Genevesian Discipline* was never mentioned in *holy Scripture*, and therefore is not to be allowed or admitted in *Christs Church*? What can you answer to this retortion, or what silly *Sophisters* are you, thus blind-fold, *andabatarum more*, to run on head-long against your adversaries, and never consider how by this *Argument* you quite undermine your own *Congregational*, *Classical*, *Synodical*, *Provincial*, and *National Assemblies*? Did you ever hear such barbarous terms in *holy Scripture*? or ever find them (at least in your sense) used by any antient Writer? Why then should you reject *Episcopal Government* so universally practised, and set up the Presbyterian *Democracy*, never heard of in the *Church* of *Christ* before *Calvin*'s days? Certainly though the one had been no better grounded on *holy Scripture* than the other, yet the antiquity of *Episcopacy*, and the quite immemorial possession of *Bishops* in the Government

vernment of the *Church* ſo many hundred years together, is reaſon enough for any peaceable *Chriſtian* to prefer it before any new-found invention: It being an undoubted *Maxim*, *In pari jure vel cauſa melior eſt conditio poſſidentis*. Moreover, according to the approved rule of St. *Auguſtin*, *That, which the univerſal Church doth hold, and was not inſtituted by Councils, but hath been always retained, we moſt juſtly believe to have deſcended from no Authority, but the Apoſtles.* lib. 4. de bapt. c. 24. ep. 119. and in ſeveral other places. Since therefore, the *Original* and beginning of *Epiſcopal* Government cannot be found from the Apoſtles downwards, we muſt conclude it is at leaſt of *Apoſtolical*, and conſequently of Divine inſtitution. But to be brief, does not St. *Paul* expreſly allow *Timothy*, the firſt *Biſhop* of the *Epheſians*, to judge the *Prieſts* or *Elders* of that Church? 1 Tim. 5. 19, 20. does not he therefore own him to be their Lawful Superior? for ſurely, common ſenſe can tell us, that no *Magiſtrate* whatſoever has any legal power to judge his equal in Authority; according to that approved *Maxim*, *Paribus in pares nulla datur poteſtas.* Since therefore it muſt be granted, either that *Timothy* had power and juriſdiction over the *Presbyters* of his *Church*, or the *Apoſtles* inſtructions to him were vain and moſt impertinent, and that none can have any lawful *juriſdiction* over his equal, it evidently enſueth, he was by the teſtimony of holy Scripture, their true and lawful *Superior*.

Secondly, you alledge, that in holy *Scripture* the ſame perſons are promiſcuouſly called *Biſhops* or *Presbyters*, Acts 20.28. *Philip.*1.1. *Tit.*1.5,7. and 1 *Tim.* 3. therefore (ſay you) they are the ſame Function. A moſt excellent piece of *Logick*. But are not the ſame perſons promiſcuouſly called *Apoſtles* and *Diſciples* in the *Goſpel?* Is it therefore the ſame thing to be an *Apoſtle* and a *Diſciple?* If ſo, to what purpoſe was *Matthias*, (who was already a *Diſciple*, Acts 1. 21.) ſo ſolemnly elected *Apoſtle* in the place of *Judas?* If not, then the *identity* of names doth not always import the *identity* of *Functions*. Likewiſe, do not we find in the old *Teſtament* the ſame perſons called ſometimes *Prieſts*, ſometimes *High-Prieſts?* as *Azariah* (2 Chron.26.17.) is called only a *Prieſt*, yet *v.* 20. he is ſtiled the *Chief-Prieſt*. Therefore either our *Presbyterian* argument is groundleſs and *Sophiſtical*, or elſe *Chief-Prieſts* differ'd nothing from the *inferiour-Prieſts* in the Old Law. And beſides, the *Apoſtles* often called themſelves *Presbyters* or *Elders*, 1 *Pet.* 5. 1. and 2 *Jo.* v. 1. and 3 *Jo.* v. 1. *&c.* Yet I hope our preſent *Religionaries* will acknowledge they differ'd from ſingle *Presbyters* both in order and juriſdiction. But to come nearer home, what is more common in our own days, than to hear *Prieſts* or *Presbyters* called *Miniſters*, which word

word properly signifieth *Deacons?* and yet it is evident, we always count *Deacons* inferiour to *Presbyters*, though the name properly belonging to the one, is often attributed to the other; why then should not we conclude, that *Presbyters* are always inferiour to *Bishops*, tho' their names had been sometimes mutually communicated to one another? For we must observe, that *Episcopus* originally signifying only an *Overseer*, as *Presbyter* signifieth an *Elder*, or Aged man, such *Presbyters* as had the Cure of Souls, and charge of small *Precincts*, now called *Parishes*, under their true *Bishop*, might well be termed *Overseers* of their respective Flocks, and consequently in some sense be termed *Episcopi* or *Bishops*: yet forasmuch as they wanted the fulness of *Ecclesiastical* power, and besides Preaching the word of God and Baptizing believers, which *Deacons* also might do, could only administer the *Sacrament* of the Lords Supper, but were not allowed to confirm the Baptized, much less to ordain other *Priests* or *Elders* in the Church, as hereafter it shall be proved; they were only *Bishops* by name, not by *Ecclesiastical* orders, even as aged persons were called *Elders* for their years, not for any Spiritual jurisdiction.

But forasmuch as some think the *Apostles* have not been very exact in expressing either the Identity or Diversity of Bishops and *Presbyters*, but left it something ambiguous, and subject to be questioned; to clear this point we shall here observe that excellent *method* prescribed by our *Royal Martyr*, for to find out the true sense of any ambiguous passage of holy *Scripture*. *If the practice of the Primitive Church* (saith he) *and the universal consent of the Fathers, be not a convincing Argument when the interpretation of Scripture is doubtfull, I know nothing.* And again: *Albeit I never esteem'd any Authority equal to the Scriptures; yet I do think the unanimous consent of the* Fathers, *and the universal practice of the* Primitive *Church to the best and most authentical interpreters of Gods word, and consequently the fittest Judges between me and you, when we differ, untill you find me a better.* In his 2. paper to *Alexander Henderson*, in the book intituled *Reliquiæ Caroline*, part 1. p. 323. *&c.* This rule therefore and prudent method we shall here observe, and for the better understanding of the foregoing texts of *Scripture*, we shall enquire into the doctrine and practice of the *Primitive Church*, concerning the distinction of *Bishops* and *Presbyters*; but let us first examine what you can produce out of these ancient monuments for your own *Genevesian Discipline*. Wherefore,

Thirdly, you object, that some ancient *Fathers* affirm, the superiority of *Bishops* above *Presbyters* to have been introduced only by the custom of the *Church*, not by any institution of *Christ*. *The same*

is

is a Presbyter (saith St. *Hierom*) *which is a Bishop, and before divisions through the Devils instigation were made in Religion, and it was said amongst the people; I am of* Paul, *and I of* Apollo, *and I of* Cephas, *the Churches were governed by the Common-Counsel of the Presbyters: but when every one thought those he baptized, to be his own, not Christs, it was decreed in all the World, that one should be chosen from among the Presbyters and placed above the rest, to whom all the care or charge of the Church should belong, and the Seed of Schism be taken away.* in cap. 1. ep. ad Tit.

This is the strongest objection or argument you can produce out of the ancient *Fathers* for your pretended holy *Discipline*, and yet so far it is from warranting that new-found device, that it quite subverts and destroys it. For tho' *St. Hierom* seems to affirm, that our *Saviour* left his *Church* at the beginning to be governed, not by *Bishops* alone, but by the common *Counsell* of the *Presbyters*, yet he plainly acknowledgeth that the *Apostles*, (in whose time people said, *I am of* Paul, *and I of* Apollos, *and I of* Cephas, as appeareth 1 Cor. 1. 12.) to avoid *Schism* (which from the *Anti-hierarchical* equality of *Ecclesiastical Pastors* should unavoidably ensue) appointed *Bishops* above the *Presbyters* to rule and Govern the *Church*, that so the seed of *Schism* might be taken away. Since therefore what the *Apostles* by vertue of their Function and Commission from *Christ* have done in the new, is with as much reason to be reputed done by *Divine Authority*, as what *Moses* did in the *Old Testament* by Gods command and inspiration: you cannot deny, if you stand to St. *Hierom*'s Testimony, but that the preheminence of *Bishops* above *Presbyters* in the *Law of Grace*, is as much *de jure divino*, as the Superiority of the *High-Priests* over the *inferiour Priests* and *Levites* in the *Law* of *Moses*.

But let us hear what the rest of the Ancient Fathers, (from whom without doubt St. *Hierom* differ'd not in so material a point) speak of this subject. St. *Ignatius*, the *Apostles* Disciple, in his epistle to the *Philadelphians* writes in this manner: *Good are the Priests and the Ministers of the Word; yet better is the Bishop, who is entrusted with the Holy of Holies, to whom alone the mysteries of God are committed.* And in the *Canons* which are commonly called the *Apostles Canons*, thus we find, can. 40. *Let not the Priests and Deacons attempt* to do *any thing without the Bishop; for to him the people of the Lord is committed, and he is to give an account for their Souls.* Tertullian likewise lib. de bapt. c. 17. saith: *The High-Priest, which is the Bishop, hath right to give Baptism, and then the Presbyters and Deacons, yet not without the Bishops leave.* And St. *Ambrose* saith in like manner: *In the Bishop there are all the orders, be-*

cause he is the first Priest, that is Prince of the Priests. in c. 4. ep. ad Ephes. And here we are to observe, that the ancient writers atribute not unto *Bishops* a bare precedence only, or a civil respect due unto them from *Presbyters* for their Age, Piety, or Learning, but do plainly acknowledge them to be the true Magistrates of *Christs Church*, endued with Power and Authority to rule and govern both Flocks and Pastors together, and accordingly they atribute unto them several *Prerogatives* and *Ecclesiastical Functions* (as we have now partly seen) that *Presbyters* were not allow'd to perform; which could never have been so universally approv'd of, had *Episcopacy* been only a *prudential* constitution of humane Wisdom, and not the absolute ordinance of Christ himself.

First, in those ancient times *Bishops* alone were allow'd to sit and vote in *Ecclesiastical Councils*, as evidently appeareth by the respective subscriptions of all the approved *Councils* held in the *Church* for the first 600. years after *Christ*. And therefore when some *Laicks* and others that were no *Bishops*, came into the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, to side with the Heretick *Dioscorus*, the *Prelates* immediately caused them to be expelled, saying: *Put out these superfluous persons, the Council belongs to the Bishops.* And *Theodosius junior* the *Emperour*, in his Epistle to the *Council* of *Ephesus*, said: *It is not lawfull for any that is not in the order of the most holy Bishops, to meddle in Ecclesiastical consultations.* To be brief, when any of the Ancient Writers do speak of these *Church-assemblies*, they always call them the *Councils* of *Bishops*: *For this cause* (saith *Eusebius*) *meetings and Councils of Bishops are called together throughout every Province.* lib. 5. hist. c. 23 and to the same purpose speaketh St. *Cyprian*, ep. ad Julian. *Athan.* ep. ad solitar. *Hilar.* lib. de synodis. *Ambros.* ep. 32. *Hieron* lib. 2. Apol. contra Ruffin. *Aug.* ep. 119. *Leo.* ep. 16. and a numberless number of other writers, always naming *Synods* of *Bishops* and *Metropolitans*, but never giving the least hint of any inferiour *Presbyters* (unless perhaps delegates) much less *lay-Elders* admitted to sit among them. Our present terms of Art, as *Congregational*, *Classical*, *Provincial*, *National* and *Synodical* Assemblies of *lay-Elders* or *single Presbyters*, were *gibbrish* to them in those *primitive* times. *Christianity* perhaps was then but a *suckling*, and therefore unfit for such *mysterious* expressions, which by a new power of the *Gospel* are able to pull down the highest *Crown*, and stoutest *Miter*, and crush them both under the *Cloak* of *Religion*.

Secondly, *Bishops* alone were admitted to confirm believers after Baptism, by imposition of hands. All the ancient writers, that speak of

of this Ceremony, do either call it the laying on of *Bishops* hands, or do expresly affirm, that none but *Bishops* can do it: Thus *Eusebius* speaking of the Schismatick *Novatus*, saith; *Neither has he obtain'd the rest, which according to the Canons of the Church he should receive after Baptism; neither was he figured by a Bishop with our Lords Seal; which when he received not, how (I beseech you) should he obtain the Holy Ghost?* lib. 6. hist. c. 35. And St. *Hierome*, dial. adversus Luciser. saith: *I confess this is the custom of the Church, that to such as are by Presbyters and Deacons baptized a far off in lesser Cities, the Bishop goes to lay his hands upon them at the invocation of the Holy Ghost.* And a little after: *If you ask, why he that is Baptized in the Church, doth not receive the Holy Ghost, but by the hand of a Bishop, which all acknowledge to be given in true Baptism. Know that this observation comes from that Authority, that after our Lords Ascension the Holy Ghost descended upon the Apostles*, &c. In like manner *Innocentius* the first, *Bishop* of *Rome* and contemporary to St. *Augustin*, ep. ad Decent. c. 3. saith: *As for Signing or Confirming Children, it is manifest, that it is not lawful to be done by any other, but by a Bishop: because Presbyters, tho' they be Priests, yet they arrive not to the height of Episcopacy. For such things to be due to Bishops alone, that they should Sign or give the Holy Ghost, not only the custom of the Church doth demonstrate, but also that lesson of the Acts of the Apostles, (c. 8. v. 14.) which tells us that* Peter *and* John *were sent, to give the Holy Ghost to those that were already Baptiz'd.*

And lest you should think that *Bishops* do not give the *Holy Ghost*, because the party confirmed does not speak with Tongues, as in the Apostles time, hear how St. *Augustin* preoccupates and censures that objection: *Is there any one* (saith he) *of so perverse an heart, as to deny these Children, on whom we have laid our hands, to have received the Holy Ghost, because they speak not with tongues?* tract 6. in ep. Joan.

Thirdly, so considerable and so weighty a business was the consecration of a *Bishop* held by the *Primitive Church*, that this solemnity could not be *Canonically* performed without the presence of all the Bishops in the Province, at least of three, the rest consenting and approving their proceedings; as it was expresly decreed in the Holy and Oecumenical Council of *Nice*, in these words: *It is indeed very convenient, that a Bishop should be ordain'd by all the Bishops in the Province, but if this be difficult either for some urgent necessity, or for the length of the journey, let three Bishops by all means meeting, and those also who are absent likewise decreeing and consenting by their writings, let the ordination be performed. Yet the validity of what is done through every Province, must be attributed to the Metropolitan Bishop*, Conc. Nicen. 1. can. 4. And the like decree

is made in the Fourth *Council* of *Carthage*, where St. *Auguſtine* alſo was preſent, *Can.* 21. in theſe words, *When a Biſhop is Ordained, let two Biſhops hold the Book of the Goſpels over his head and ſhoulders, and one of them pouring Benediction upon him, let all the other Biſhops that are preſent touch his head with their hands.* See *Conc. Carth.* 2. *Can.* 12. & *Carth.* 3. *Can.* 39. And in the next enſuing *Canon*, ſpeaking of the Ordination of *Preſbyters*, they ſpeak in this manner, *When a Presbyter is Ordain'd, the Biſhop bleſſing him, and holding his hand upon his head, let all the Presbyters alſo that are preſent lay their hands upon his head by the Biſhops hands.* And *Can.* 4. thus they preſcribe the Ordination of *Deacons*, *When a Deacon is Ordain'd, let the Biſhop onely that bleſſeth him lay his hand upon his head, becauſe he is not Conſecrated to the Prieſthood, but to the Miniſtery.* Theſe two laſt *Canons* I mention here, that by the different degrees of the *Solemnities* and *Ceremonies* uſed at the Conſecration of *Biſhops*, *Preſbyters*, and *Deacons* in the *Primitive Church*, people may underſtand how differently *Chriſtians* in thoſe days eſteemed of theſe three *Eccleſiaſtical Orders*. If we may rationally gather, that *Deacons* were then counted inferiour to *Presbyters*, becauſe they were Ordained with leſs *Solemnities*, and fewer *Ceremonies*; ſurely we have here the ſelf ſame reaſon to think *Presbyters* inferiour to *Biſhops*.

Fourthly, in thoſe *Primitive* times, *Biſhops* alone were allowed to confer *holy Orders*, or ordain *Eccleſiaſtical Miniſters*, as evidently appeareth by the conſtant practice of *Chriſts Church* ſince the very beginning of *Chriſtianity*. Firſt, our Saviour himſelf, who is *the Shepherd and Biſhop of our ſouls*, 1 *Pet.* 2. 25. while he converſed here upon earth, ordained firſt his twelve *Apoſtles*, then his ſeventy *Diſciples*, *Luke* 9. 1. and 10. 1. and after our *Saviours* time, the *Apoſtles* (who were alſo *Biſhops*, *Acts* 1. 20.) either Ordained *Presbyters* and *Deacons* in thoſe *Churches* they converted to the Chriſtian Faith, *Acts* 6. 6. and 14. 23. or appointed others, whom they inveſted with *Epiſcopal* Authority to Ordain them: This appears by St. *Pauls* Epiſtle to *Titus*, (who was the firſt Biſhop of *Crete*, as all Antiquity, and particularly *Euſebius* in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, *lib.* 3. *c.* 4. and our own *Bibles*, at the end of the aforeſaid Epiſtle do teſtifie) where the *Apoſtle* ſaith, he left *Titus* in that Iſland, purpoſely to Ordain *Elders* in every City, *Tit.* 1. 5. But to what purpoſe (I think you ſhould St. *Paul* leave *Titus* in *Crete* to Ordain *Elders*, if every inferiour *Presbyter* could perform this duty? Was there no *Presbyter* in *Crete* but *Titus* alone? or if there were, why did not he enjoyn them to Ordain thoſe *Elders*, or at leaſt joyn them in Commiſſion with *Titus*? Moreover, if ſingle

Presbyters had power to ordain *Clergy-men* in the Apostles time, how came they to lose this Authority in ensuing Ages? Is it not evident that all antient Writers always attribute Ordinations onely to Bishops? nay, they thought this power so inseparable from them, that they held it the chiefest; and sometimes in comparison the sole *Prerogative* belonging to the *Episcopal* Function, and much insisted upon this point, in proving the preheminence of *Bishops* above *Presbyters*, and all other *Ecclesiastical* Ministers, which had not the power of Ordination. See *Conc. Antioch. cap.* 10. *Ancyran. cap.* 12. *Ambrose*, *Chrysostom*, *Theodoret*, and *Theophylact*, *in* 1 *Tim.* 3 & 3 *Hiero. ep.* 85. *ad Evagr. Epiphan. Her.* 75. *Aug in Breviculo, collat.* 3. *c* 5. *Damas. ep.* 3. *de Chorepiscopis. Leo ep.* 88. and many others. St. *Hierom*, though a great Patron to *Presbyters*, and a zealous maintainer of their just priviledges, yet confesseth *Bishops* alone had the power of Ordination. *What doth a Bishop do*, (saith he) *except Ordination, that a Presbyter may not do? Ep.* 85 *ad Evagr.* And St. *Chrysostom* likewise, *Hom.* 11. *in* 1 *Tim.* 3. saith, *Between a Bishop and a Presbyter almost there is no difference, for to Presbyters also the care of the Church is permitted; and what he said of Bishops do agree also to Presbyters, for by Ordination onely the Bishops are their Superiours, and this alone they seem to have more than Presbyters.* St. *Ambrose* also in 1 *Tim.* 3. saith, *A Bishop and a Presbyter have one Ordination, and each of them is a Priest; but the Bishop is first, so that every Bishop is a Presbyter, but not every Presbyter a Bishop, for he is Bishop that is first among the Presbyters. Finally he signifieth, that* Timothy *was ordained Presbyter, yet because he had none before him, he was a Bishop, and therefore he shews him how he may Ordain a Bishop; for it was neither just nor lawful, that an Inferiour should Ordain his Superiour, for none gives what he hath not received. How is it possible* (saith St. *Epiphanius*, *Her.* 75.) *that he should Ordain a Presbyter, who hath no right of laying on his hands to Ordain, or say that he is equal to a Bishop?* And the *Council* of *Laodicea*, held *Anno* 320. *cap.* 26. expresly declareth, *That such as are not Ordained by Bishops, cannot* exorcise (*&* a fortiori, administer the Sacraments) *either in Churches or Houses.* And likewise the *Council* of *Ancyra*, *cap.* 12. (*anno* 314.) saith, *That it is not lawful for Chorepiscopi's to Ordain Priests or Deacons.*

But *Damasus*, Bishop of *Rome*, contemporary to St. *Hierom*, expresly declares Ordinations given by single Presbyters not onely *unlawful*, but also *void* and *null* from the beginning; for in his Third Epistle, speaking of the aforesaid *Ecclesiastical* Persons, called *Chorepiscopi*, who though no Bishops, but onely their Substitutes, or Vicar-Generals,

pre-

presumed as *Bishops* to Ordain others *Presbyters* and *Deacons*) he writes in this manner, *Whatsoever they have done in the aforesaid Ministery of High-Priesthood, it is void and null.* Neither is this a new-found Paradox, or a private opinion of this Bishop, but rather so undoubted a Doctrine, that the invincible *Antagonist* of the *Arians*, the great *Athanasius* insisted upon it in the Council of *Tyre*, (where he was surrounded by all his enemies, as a *Lamb* among so many *Lions*) and used it as an uncontrollable argument against the malice of the wicked *Ischyras*, who pretending himself a *Presbyter*, Ordained by *Collnthus* a pretended *Bishop*, falsly accused this *Champion* of Christ with breaking the Cup, wherein himself administred the holy *Communion*; which calumny St. *Athanasius* openly confuted, by proving, that *Ischyras* was no true *Presbyter*, as not being ordained by a true *Bishop*, and consequently could not administer that *Sacrament*. This passage is related by St. *Athanasius* himself, in his second *Apology*, where he speaks in this manner, *The Priest that is pretended to have been present, is that so often spoken of* Ischyras, *who was neither chosen Presbyter by the Church, nor when* Alexander *received the Prethyters Ordained by* Miletius, *was he ever counted in that number, nor by him created. How then is* Ischyras *a Presbyter, or by whom was he Ordained? Was he Ordained by* Colluthus? *for that is the onely shift now remaining; but that* Colluthus *died in the degree of Presbytery, and that all his impositon of hands were annulled, and all those that were Ordained by him reduced into the Order of Laicks, and under the name of Laicks admitted to the Communion, is so manifest a thing, that none can doubt thereof.* And again in the same Apology, *They suborned one* Ischyras, *a man that was no Priest, though he boasted of that name, for he was Ordained by one* Colluthus, *not a true, but an imaginary Bishop, who in a General Council was commanded by* Otius *and other Bishops then present, that he should behave himself onely as a Presbyter as he was before; and therefore all those that were Ordained by him, returned unto their own antient state, among whom* Ischyras *also is to be counted.*

Now the force of this Argument consists not in the single testimony of St. *Athanasius*, though that same (in my opinion) ought to be preferred before the Chymera's of *John Calvin*, and a million of his *Myrmidons*; but it principally consists in these two points: The first is, That he produces a *General Council*, which likely may be the *Nicene*, to make good his assertion. The second is, That if this Doctrine had not been then unanimously received, as well by the *Heterodox* as by the *Orthodox* Believers, and consequently by all *Christians* in general, the *Arrians*, who left no stone unremov'd to confute their great *Antagonist*,

tagoniſt, would ſoon overthrow St. *Athanaſius* his Plea, and tell him, (as *Presbyterians* now would do) *Ischyras* was a true *Presbyter*, though not Ordained by any Biſhop, becauſe ſingle Presbyters could lawfully Ordain.

To all theſe preſſing arguments, which are enough to convince any man not wilfully blind, or poſſeſs'd with the ſpirit of contradiction, we may add another inſoluble *demonſtration ad hominem*, out of our adverſaries own conceſſions. For *Presbyterians* cannot deny, but that the *Sabbath* was *Jure Divino* transferr'd from the Seventh to the Firſt day of the Week; it being unlawful for any earthly power to alter what *God* has ſo ſolemnly eſtabliſh'd in the old Law: And likewiſe they cannot deny, but that *Infants* are *Jure Divino* capable of *Baptiſm*: Yet I defie any *Presbyterian* upon earth to ſhew better proofs for either of theſe tenets, than I have ſhew'd hitherto for the Superiority of *Biſhops* above *Presbyters*. For the grounds of all theſe points is holy *Scripture*, not ſolely or ſimply taken, but as interpreted by the *univerſal* practice and tradition of *Chriſts Church* ſince the beginning of *Chriſtianity*: why then (*good Presbyterians*) ſhould not theſe grounds prove the latter to be *Jure Divino*, as well as the former? or by what authority do you preſume to admit the one, and reject the other?

If you inſiſt upon *Scripture* alone in maintaining either *Pædobaptiſm* or the tranſlation of the *Sabbath*, you ſhall thereby gain no more, but make your ſelves a laughing-ſtock to all learned and Judicious men. For as to the obſervation of *Sunday*, it is ſo obſcurely delivered in the new *Teſtament*, (and the old is diametrically againſt it) that thereby you cannot convince any oppoſer whatſoever; the places alledged for it, are theſe that follow: *Upon the firſt day of the Week the Diſciples came together to break Bread.* Acts 20. 27. *Upon the firſt day of the Week let every one lay by him in ſtore*, &c. 1 *Cor.* 16. 2. *I was in Spirit on the Lords Day.* Revel. 1. 10. Yet none of all theſe texts can convince the *Sabbath* to have been lawfully tranſlated from *Saturday* to *Sunday*. For to the firſt it may be anſwered, that as the Diſciples broke Bread upon the firſt day of the week, ſo (no doubt) they did ſometimes upon every day of the week, as appeareth *Acts* 2. 46. and therefore we cannot conclude hence the change of the *Sabbath* to the firſt, rather than to any other day. The ſecond likewiſe proves no more but that the *Apoſtle* adviſeth the *Corinthians* to begin the week with an Act of *Charity*, laying aſide then ſome relief for their oppreſſed Brethren. And moreover, it is obſervable, that in both theſe places the Original Greek hath not, *the firſt day of the week*, but μίαν τῶν σαββάτων,

one:

one of the Sabbaths, which renders the matter yet more obscure, and less decidable by *Scripture*. As for the last, it may be said, that every day is the *Lords Day*, and yet some are so called, because something remarkable relating to God happens in those days. Thus the *Day of Judgment* is called the *Lords Day*, Mal. 4. 5. and 1 Thes. 5. 2. and 2 Pet. 3. 10. yet no man, I think, can affirm, that it falls upon *Sunday*. And in this sense the day spoken of by St. *John*, might well be called the *Lords Day* tho' not *Sunday*, because of the manifold Mysteries, which God was pleased then to reveal to his beloved Disciple.

Now as to the second point, so far it is from being warranted by any express *Scripture*, that the ancient Writers do commonly hold it only as an *Apostolical* Tradition. *The Church* (saith *Origenes*) *receiv'd as a tradition from the Apostles to give Baptism even to Children*, lib. 5. in c. 6 ep. ad Rom. And St. *Augustin* saith in like manner: *The custom of our Mother the Church in Baptizing Children, is not at all to be despised, nor by any means to be counted superfluous, nor yet to be believed, unless it were an Apostolical Tradition*, lib. 10. de Gen c. 23. And as for those passages of *Scripture*, which are commonly produced for *Pædo-baptism*, as the example of *Circumcision*, *Christ*'s receiving little Children, and the *Apostles* Baptizing whole Families; tho' together with the *universal* tradition and *practice* of the whole *Church* since our *Saviour*'s Ascension, they are indeed sufficient grounds for this custom, yet solely taken by themselves alone, they cannot satisfie or convince any inquisitive man. For to the example of *Circumcision*, it may be soon answered, that *Baptism* doth necessarily presuppose Faith, which *Circumcision* did not: For in the Old Testament it was not said, *Teach and Circumcise*, or *He that believeth and is Circumcised*, &c. as it was said in the New, *Teach all Nations, Baptizing them*, &c. Matth. 28. 19. *He that believeth and is Baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not, shall be damned*, Mark 16. 16. Wherefore tho' children could be circumcised in the Old Law, *Gen.* 17. 12. Yet this proves not that we ought now to administer unto them the Sacrament of *Baptism*, which seemeth always to presuppose Divine *Faith*, whereof infants are uncapable, because they have *no knowledg between Good and Evil*, Deut. 1. 39. And likewise to our *Saviour*'s words; *Suffer little Children to come unto me, and forbid them not: For of such is the Kingdom of God*, Mark 10. 14. It may be answer'd, first, that *Christ* admitted *Publicans* and sinners to come unto him, which yet could not be lawfully Baptiz'd without true Faith and Repentance; 2ly, that these Children, whereof our Saviour speaketh, were Circumcised, and consequently were in effect

Bapti-

Baptiz'd according to the Rites of the Old Law. And as to those passages, where whole families are said to have been Baptiz'd, *Acts* 16. 15, 33 and 1 *Cor.* 1. 16. It cannot be deny'd, but it is probable there were some infants in those families; yet here we do not look for probable guesses, but for undeniable testimonies: for since it is evident, that Children cannot actually believe, Deut. 1. 39. and that holy Scripture in several places expresly requireth faith in such as are to be Baptiz'd, *Mark* 16. 16. *Acts* 8 37 I think, probable conjectures can be no sufficient warrant for us to do any thing so apparently repugnant to holy Scripture.

It is plain therefore, that neither *Pædo-baptism*, nor the translation of the *Sabbath* can ever be proved by Scripture alone; all these texts are so ambiguous and uncertain, that had they not been confirmed by the constant practice and tradition of the Church in all Ages (which undoubtedly is the best gloss and comment we can find on Gods word) we could never be assured of either of these tenets, or convince any opposer of their verity.

Now it is evident by all Antiquity, that nothing could be more universally practiced, than the Superiority and Jurisdiction of *Bishops* above *Presbyters* has been in the *Primitive Church*; and withall it is manifest, that this practice is as much grounded on Holy Scripture, as either of the aforesaid tenets: Why then should we not conclude *Episcopacy* to be *Jure Divino* above *Presbytery*, as well as the Presbyterians hold Infants to be *Jure Divino* capable of Baptism, and the *Sabbath* to have been in like manner Translated from Saturday to Sunday?

But our holy Brethren have got an invincible Argument to oppose against all these unanswerable Authorities, and what is this, but their own new-found *Gloss* upon St. *Paul*'s ambiguous words; the Apostle (say they) declares, that *Timothy* was ordained by *Presbyters*, when he saith, *Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by Prophesie, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery*, 1 *Tim.* 4 14. But this is a new-found *Gloss* indeed, for no antient Writer, if not *Aerius* and his *Sticklers*, ever dreamt thereof before *John Calvin* and his illuminated Sectaries, have found it out by a new *Revelation*. St. *Hierom*, by those words, *with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery*, understands the hands, whereby *Timothy* received the Order of Presbytery or Priesthood.

St. *Chrysostom*, *Theodoret*, and others, do understand it of *Bishops*, to whom alone it belonged to confer *Ecclesiastical Orders*. But however it be interpreted, certain it is, that *Timothy* was never Or-

dained by ſingle *Presbyters*, St. *Paul* expreſly affirming he conſecrated him himſelf, where he ſaith, *Stir up the gift of God which is in thee, by the putting on of my hands*, 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. Wherefore if by *Presbytery* we underſtand the perſons that were *Presbyters*, whether ſingle *Presbyters* or *Biſhops*, and not the Order of *Presbytery* or *Prieſthood*, as St. *Hierom* expounds it, we muſt underſtand it not of any *Presbyters* Ordaining or Conſecrating *Timothy*, whereas the *Apoſtle* himſelf was his Conſecrator, but of ſuch as aſſiſted at his Ordination, who according to the aforeſaid Second and Third Canon of the Fourth *Council* of *Carthage*, were, together with the Conſecrator, to lay their hands on the head of the Perſon Ordained *Presbyter* or *Biſhop*.

Our godly *Goſpellers* have one Objection more, if yet it deſerves that name, againſt *Epiſcopal* Juriſdiction, or rather againſt the undue exerciſe thereof The fourth *Council* of *Carthage* (ſay they) has decreed, *cap.* 23. *That no Biſhop, without the aſſiſtance of his Clergy, ſhould hear or determine Eccleſiaſtical Cauſes, otherwiſe the Biſhops Sentence ſhould be void and null, unleſs it were confirmed by the preſence of his Clergy.* But what can this make for our *Presbyterian Democracy*, or againſt the Superiority of *Biſhops* to be *de Jure Divino*, which is the chiefeſt Point controverted between us, I cannot in the leaſt comprehend. As for our part, we always acknowledge, that ſince the beginning of *Chriſtianity*, *Biſhops* had commonly about them many of their ableſt *Prieſts* and *Divines*, as it were their *Spiritual Privy Counſellers*, to conſult about *Eccleſiaſtical* matters, without whoſe conſent and approbation, they ſeldom tranſacted any matters of moment, even as *Kings* and *Princes* ſeldom tranſact matters of *State* without conſulting their *Privy Council*. Thus St. *Cyprian* ſaith, himſelf was accuſtomed to uſe the advice of his *Prieſts* and Learned *Clergy* in exerciſing his *Eccleſiaſtical* Function, and ordering the affairs of his Church. Yet this argues no more the *parity* of Prieſts and Biſhops, than the aforeſaid cuſtom of Princes proves the equality of Kings and Privy Counſellers. Nay further, though Biſhops could not determine *Eccleſiaſtical* matters without the advice and conſent of at leaſt the major part of their *Clergy*, yet it ſhould not immediately follow, that they are both of equal power, either of *Order* or *Juriſdiction*; even as many *Kings* of *Europe* can neither make new *Laws*, nor repeal the old, without the aſſent of the *States* of their *Kingdoms*, yet are far above any of theſe *States* in power and authority. Likewiſe *Judges* in *England* can ſeldom give ſentence of death againſt any man, without the aſſent and verdict of the Jury, and yet the Jury is not of equal power and commiſſion with the Judges in deciding ſuch capital crimes.

Where-

Wherefore we ſay (as it hath been already proved) that *Biſhops* are truely ſuperiour to their *Clergy*, and have power from *Chriſt* to rule and govern both the Flock and Paſtors together. Yet we confeſs, they muſt not rule arbitrarily, or domineer over their inferiours; *not being Lords* (as St. *Peter* ſaith) *over Gods heritage, but being enſamples to the flock*, 1 *Pet.* 5. 3. ſurpaſſing the inferiour Clergy in humility, as they exceed them in dignity; for as our Saviour ſaith to his Apoſtles, *The Princes of the Gentiles exerciſe dominion over them, and they that are great exerciſe authority upon them. But it ſhall not be ſo among you; but whoſoever will be great among you, let him be your miniſter; and whoſoever will be chief among you, let him be your ſervant. Even as the Son of man came not to be miniſtred unto, but to miniſter, and to give his life a ranſome for many*, *Matth.* 20. 25, 26, 27, 28. But if the *Apoſtles* were not allowed to exerciſe any arbitrary or domineering power over *Chriſtians*, without doubt Biſhops, who are but the Apoſtles Succeſſors, have no right to do it; yet this hindereth not, but they may uſe their Spiritual Authority againſt obſtinate and rebellious perſons, who (like *Corah* and his Accomplices pretending an Arbitrary Government in *Moſes* and *Aaron*, *Numb.* 16. 3.) inſolently depart from their lawful Paſtors and Superiors, making themſelves Ring leaders of Schiſmatical Factions; for in this caſe they may ſay with the Apoſtles, *The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God, to the pulling down of ſtrong holds; caſting down imaginations and every high thing that exalteth it ſelf againſt the knowledg of God, and bringing into Captivity every thought to the obedience of Chriſt*, 2 Cor. 10. 4, 5.

Having thus examined (*Good Presbyterians*) the pretended grounds of your *ſeparation* from our *Church* and *Communion*, I appeal now to your own conſciences, if the *Independent Presbyterians* had not as much reaſon as you can here produce, to depart from your *fraternity*, and the *Quakers*, *Levellers*, and all thoſe *Leviathan* monſters (which like *Muſhrooms* ſprung up in the late confuſion) to depart from the *Independents*. Shew me I beſeech you, ſome reaſon or authority warranting the one, and condemning the other. Shew me but one expreſs text of *Scripture*, or one true preſident of antiquity for your *Presbyterian Democracy*, and I will be of your *Communion*. In the interim, I beg of you impartially to conſider, how deſperate is your condition, and upon what *groundleſs* grounds you ſeparate your ſelves from the *Mother Church*. Do not think that your uſual pretence of differing from her, not in any neceſſary point of faith (as you ſay) but only in ſome inferiour truths and few ceremonies, can juſtify your departing from her *Communion*. For undoubtedly, the leſs you diſſent from her In Do-

trine, the more you are to be ſuſpected of the heinous crime of *Schiſm*, which is commonly defined by learned men, *A wilful Separation from the Communion of a Chriſtian Society without any ſufficient cauſe.* If therefore you diſſent from the *Church* of *England* only in outward Ceremonies, and ſome few unneceſſary points of Doctrine; ſurely, you have no ſufficient cauſe to forſake her *Communion*; ſince in reaſon nothing leſs than a damnable and intolerable error either in faith or manners, can warrant us to diſobey our Superiors, whom by the expreſs word of God we are indiſpenſably obliged to obey, *Heb.* 13. 17. How then can you juſtifie your departure from the *Obedience* of your lawfull *Biſhops*, or clear your ſelves from the brand of *Schiſm*, if you differ from them only in ſuch trivial points of *Religion?*

Do but conſider a little, what unſpeakable miſeries this your ſeparation has cauſed this 100 years paſt in this Iſland of Great *Britain.* What factions, what diviſions, what maſſacres it occaſioned among us? how ſtrangely it weaken'd our Government both Spiritual and Temporal, and encouraged our enemies ſo often to deſign our ruine, they knowing that *a Kingdom divided againſt it ſelf, is eaſily brought to deſolation?* Matth. 12. 25. What *Locuſts* of unheard off Sectaries it produced, to the apparent ruine of ſo many ſeduced ſouls? Our *Muggletonians*, *Quakers*, *Levellers*, *Brownists*, and a numberleſs number of other *Apocalyptical Enthuſiaſts*, we muſt chiefly atribute to your pretended refining of the *Reformation*; for by your example they perſwaded themſelves, they might as well reform your *Goſpel*, as you pretend to reform the *Church* of *England.* Conſider, I ſay, this *deluge* of miſchief brought upon your native *Country*, through your groundleſs ſeparation and diſobedience to your lawful Paſtors, and tell me, what good has your pretended *Holy Diſcipline* ever done to the *Church* of *Chriſt*, to countervail theſe woful calamities? Or do you think, it is poſſible, that ſuch a *diſcipline* ſhould be of God, which upon ſuch trivial pretences is the occaſion of ſo much trouble and confuſion?

Wherefore, *Good and well-meaning Presbyterians* (for ſuch to be among you I muſt in charity believe, and with ſuch only I have any hopes to prevail) if you expect the bleſſing of God, and the love of the *Church* of *England*, or if you deſire not to be reputed, as well as Papiſts, ſworn enemies to all *Epiſcopal* Proteſtants, lay aſide this Spirit of contradiction, and ſince the *Prophet* aſſures us, that *to obey is beter than Sacrifice*, 1 Sam. 15. 22. *Obey you them that have rule over you* (as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh, *Heb.* 13. 17.) *and ſubmit your ſelves* to thoſe, who by the Laws of the Land, by the Canons of ſo many ancient *Councils*, and the univerſal uninterrupted cuſtom of the *Church* of God ſince the *Apoſtles* time,

time, are appointed your Paſtors and Prelates to direct and guide you in ſpiritual matters. Forſake theſe factious *Ring leaders*, who make you but Aſſes for themſelves to ride upon in ſtate, and therefore to make themſelves great, mind nothing but Sedition and Rebellion, tho' to you they pretend but *Religion* and *Liberty*, uſing (as St. *Peter* ſpeaketh) *their liberty for a Cloak of Malicioufneſs*, 1 Pet. 2. 16. like theſe wicked *hypocrites* deſcribed by *Leo* the great, ep. 23. in theſe words: *Private deſigns are carryed on under the pretence of piety, and every one has Religion as the Handmaid of his ambition.* For (as our *Royal Martyr* elegantly ſaith) *It is no news to have all inovations uſher'd in with the name of Reformations in Church and State, by thoſe, who ſeeking to gain reputation with the vulgar for their extraordinary parts and piety, muſt needs undo what ever was formerly ſetled, never ſo well and wiſely*; in his Eikon Baſilike, c 16. *For I have obſerved* (ſaith he again c. 27.) *that the Devil of Rebellion doth commonly turn himſelf into an Angel of Reformation; and the Old Serpent can pretend new lights. When ſome mens conſciences accuſe them of ſedition and faction, they ſtop its mouth with the name and noiſe of Religion.*

Forſake you therefore ſuch counterfeit *Religionaries*, and take notice of what the *Angel* ſaid to *Hagar* in the Deſert; *Return to thy Miſtriſs; and ſubmit thy ſelf under her hands*, Gen. 16. 9. Return you to the *Church* of *England*, and if you intend to eſcape out of the *Deſert* of *Schiſm*, ſubmit to her Laws and Ordinances; ſhe will receive you with as much tenderneſs and affection, as the *Father* embraced his *Prodigal* Son in the *Goſpel*, Luke 15. 20.

By this you ſhall fully clear your ſelves of all imputations of *Schiſm* and innovations, and ſhall avoid all future ſuſpicions of contriving any *Stratagems* to ruine your native *Country*, or ſubvert the *Government* either of *Church* or *State*; you ſhall ſtrengthen the *Proteſtant* intereſt both at home and abroad, be a means by degrees to ſuppreſs *Popery* and all thoſe muſhrums of *Chriſtianity*, that ſpring up among us, and procure to your ſelves peace and quietneſs both in this World and in the World to come; which *God* of his mercy Grant us all; *Amen.*

AN

An Advertiſement to all true Proteſtants.

My beloved Countrymen *of the* Church *of* England

AS I have undertaken both this and the former treatiſe for your ſakes, to make you ſenſible of the *Presbyterians* impoſtures, and deceitful contrivances againſt our *Church* and *State*; ſo now I humbly dedicate and recommend them to your ſerious conſiderations. Truly I have been always very loath to rub up theſe old ſores, which have ſo lately coſt us ſo much Money and Bloud, to the draining both of Purſe and Veins, or mention thoſe monſtrous *Tragedies* which within the memory of man have been acted upon the Stage of this unfortunate Iſland; and had people now been as unwilling to tread the ſteps of their predeceſſors, as I am to rake up thoſe curſed Cindars, the world ſhould be troubled neither with my papers, nor their frenzies. But foraſmuch as there are at preſent ſuch certain ſigns and ſymptoms apparently to be read in the words and actions of ſome diſcontented *Religionaries*, that whoſoever hath but eyes to ſee, may apprehend ſome fatal *Apoplexy* to be near at hand: I think it no leſs than our intereſt, timely to look about us, leaſt we be again ſurpriz'd by theſe politick *Machiavels*, who unleſs prudently prevented by thoſe who ſit at the Helm, I am afraid, will once more attempt to reſtore their ſo much long'd for Common-wealth.

Yet this, I do not ſay, is (at leaſt directly) intended by the generality, nor yet the major part of that faction. I doubt not, but there are, and have always been, even in that Communion ſome vertuous and godly men, who were rather moved by an ignorant *Zeal* and the peſtilent influence of their *Ring-leaders*, to commit thoſe prodigious actions, than of themſelves any thing inclined to act ſuch abominable wickedneſs. Wherefore, I think it is the duty of all Charitable *Proteſtants*, to diſtinguiſh, as far as poſſible, between a miſled *Presbyterian* and a miſleading *Factioneer*, and accordingly pity the one, but hate and deteſt the other. Pity thoſe, who through their credulity and well-meaning *Zeal* are ſo deluded by their *Primum Mobile's*, that unawares they are forced to act againſt their inclinations; but hate and curſe the reſt, whoſe *Religion* we find by experience is *Rebellion*, whoſe *Faith* is *Faction*, and whoſe practice is the *deſtruction* of *Kings and Kingdoms*, whenſoever they find opportunity, and their ability correſpondent to their malice: yet ſtill to take heed, and carefully beware of both, vigilantly watching over their proceedings, leaſt our careleſneſs and ſtupidi-

ty

ty may at any time encourage them to attempt our ruine.

Wherefore, my beloved *Countrymen*, let us consider how as our *Saviour* was crucified between two Thieves, so is the *Church* of *England* now endangered between two extrems, the *Presbyterians* and *Papists*, both being equally willing, tho' not equally able to destroy us. The *Papists*, I know, are no less apt than the *Presbyterians*, to commit any treacheries to promote their superstition; but through *Gods* providence, their power now is so weak and inconsiderable, that whensoever they attempt our ruine, they will but hasten their own; for I dare venture my life, I might with a thousand, nay, 500. armed men destroy all the Papists in *England* at this present hour. But the *Presbyterians* are so numerous and of such formidable greatness, daily encreasing by our malecontents and ambitious grandees, that if not timely prevented by our prudent Magistrates, our Orthodox *Churches* shall be ere long but Cyphers to their *Schismatical* Conventicles. We see how boldly they speak every where, and especially in their Coffee-houses (those Shops of Sedition and Anvils of Rebellion) against our *Bishops* and *Prelates*, nay, against our *King* and Government, labouring to poyson the short sighted rabble with their seditious libells and pamphlets. They often repeat those *Antimonarchical* expressions of the *Rump-Parliament*, that the King of *England* is entrusted with a limited power, and oblig'd to govern according to the *Laws* of the *Land*, insomuch that they count it a crime of the deepest die for any man to affirm, that the *King* can hinder or suspend the execution of any Law whatsoever; tho' they cannot deny, but that in several occurrences *summum jus* is *summa injuria*; whence our late *Sovereign* writing to his present *Majesty*, judiciously said: *Your prerogative is best shewed and exercised in remitting, rather than exacting the rigour of the Laws; there being nothing worse than legal tyranny.* In his Eicon Basilike, c. 27. And truly, had all the *Laws* formerly enacted and now in force against *Nonconformists*, been now put in execution against the *Presbyterians*, I doubt not, but we should often hear of *Oppression* and *Tyranical* Government, from these very creatures, who now so vehemently press the execution of the *Laws*: so that we see, it is altogether impossible for any *King* to satisfie such unsatiable *Republicans*, unless he unkings himself and become a slave to the worst of Subjects.

And yet notwithstanding all these *Anarchical* contrivances of the *Puritans*, they are tolerated, they are countenanced, yea, seconded by persons, who by their places, by their oaths, and by their allegiance are obliged to maintain with the hazard of their lives the prerogatives of the *Crown*, and liberties of the *Church* of *England*. Nay, if we believe

lieve the *Presbyterians* themselves, they have the chiefest part of the great City of *London* to joyn with them in their great and unsearchable deligns. Yet so incredible a story it is, that the *Londoners*, after their unspeakable losses by the late *Presbyterian* Rebellion, should now countenance, much less promote the like Insurrection, whereby whosoever wins, they are sure to be losers; that I admire if any man of sense can give credit to so unlikely a busmess. Is it possible, that this famous *Metropolitan City* should be insensible of all the indignities and losses they sustained by these disloyal *Gospellers*? or forget what vast sums of money were daily squeez'd out of their purses, without any hopes of payment? How many thousands of their Children and Apprentices were pressed for Soldiers, and forced to fight against those very persons, to whom they ow'd their being and education? How can they digest to remember their *Lord Mayor* violently deposed, their *Aldermen* and chiefest *Citizens* barbarously imprisoned by these hellish *Incendiaries*, without any colour of Justice? And, in brief, can any length of time wear out of their memories the inhumane Butcheries committed upon their unarmed *Apprentices* in *Easter*, 1649. when the *Arch-Tyrant Cromwel* himself cried to the Soldiers, *to kill man, woman, and child, and fire the City about their ears*? See the *History of Independency*, *Part* 1. *page* 49 and 68. and *Part* 2. *page* 150. These and many other indignities cast upon this great and famous *City*, for imprudently adhering to that *Rebellious Faction*, are so strong in my judgment, that I will sooner believe them destitute of all sense and reason, than inclin'd now to prostitute their *Loyalty* to so treacherous a *Party*. 'Tis a common saying, *If a man deceives me once, it is his fault; but if he deceives me again, it is my own.* Wherefore since the *Londoners*, by the *Presbyterians* specious pretences, and promises of Reformation, have been once deluded to side with those *sanctified Brethren*, and have by woful experience found they were deceived; if they should again upon the same grounds engage themselves into the like troubles, surely neither friend nor foe would pity their sufferings, neither God nor man would pardon their treacheries.

Reformation indeed both in *Church* and *State* is so considerable a Treasure to the *Weal publick*, that he must be reputed a sworn Enemy to *God* and his *Countrey* that would in the least oppose it; yet to endeavour to introduce it by violent and tumultuous means, or without the joynt and free concurrence both of Prince and People, is a *remedy* far worse than the *disease*, which will produce nothing but *Anarchy* and *Irreligion*. For even as people talk, that it's easie for *Conjurers* to raise the *Devil*, but to lay or conjure him away, is very hard

and

and difficult; ſo, it is very feaſible for *factious fellows* to create troubles and diſturbances in a *Kingdom*, but to allay the Tempeſt, and bring things again to a firm ſettlement, *hoc opus, hic labor eſt.* The reaſon is, becauſe when a body *politick* is once in ſuch a violent commotion, it is impoſſible for people to ſtand or reſt where they deſigned, the throng will undoubtedly carry them beyond their aim, and at laſt make them either act againſt their conſciences, or ſuffer againſt their wills. This we find true by experience in our late *Tragical* confuſion, when I am confident a great many of thoſe, who voted for raiſing an Army againſt their Sovereign for to promote their pretended *Reformation* either in *Church* or *State*, never deſigned to Sacrifice his Sacred perſon for not conſenting to their demand. Yet they were ſo over-acted by a prevailing party, that even as they did not aſſiſt his Majeſty when they could, ſo when they would, it was not in their power to help him, according to that ancient ſaying:

He that will not, when he may;
When he will, he ſhall have nay.

And yet after all theſe diſmal combuſtions, which made *England* the Theatre of the Worlds wonder, ſo far were the three Nations from their promiſed and expected *Reformation*, that they grew daily worſe and worſe, and fell at laſt into all kind of *Libertiniſm* and *Prophaneneſs*. Their pretended *Reformers* have indeed made a thorow *Reformation* in the peoples purſes, but never endeavour'd to procure it either in *Church* or *Commonwealth*, but rather Crucified both with St. *Peter's* Crucifixion the heels upwards and the head downwards. For as for the one, tho' in ſome ſort they caſt out the unclean Spirit of *Popery*, yet they brought in not ſeven (as the *Goſpel* ſpeaketh Matth. 12. 45.) but rather *Seventy other unclean Spirits, more wicked than the former.* So that this Iſland was a Pantheon, a Temple for all Gods and Religions. And the other they brought to that paſs, that in *April* 1649. after the unparalell'd Murder of their *Sovereign*, people openly ſaid: *We never ſuffer'd the thouſandth part of the oppreſſions, we now groan under.* And ſurely, they could not chooſe, having now inſtead of one pretended, ſo many real *Tyrants*, who like the 30. *Tyrants* of *Athens* inſolently domineer'd over the oppreſſed people, and Arbitrarily govern'd the whole *Kingdom.* Of whom we may truly ſay with the *Author* of the Hiſtory of *Independency*, part 1. p. 140. *Theſe are they, that with* Hananiah *break the wooden-yoke from our necks* (Jer. 28. 13.) *and put on a yoke of Iron:*

free us from a little Ship-money paid thrice in an Age, and impose as much at once for a Monthly Tax: quit us of the Monopolies of Tobacco, and set up Excise on Bread and Beer. The first easeth the Wanton Rich man, and the later grindeth the needy and poor. Yet these are thy Gods, O London; *these are the Idol-Calves the people have set up and do worship: These be the Molech to whom ye Sacrifice Sons and Servants by Troops, Regiments and Armies, to maintaine their Soveraignty, Rebellion and Profit.*

Having therefore this woful experience of the dismal consequences inevitably ensuing a violent *Reformation*, can any man be so senseless as to believe that the now *Loyal* as well as *Prudent Citizens* of *London* would side with these counterfeit *Religionaries*, in embroiling the *Kingdom* again in such intestine troubles, as have so lately cost them their reputation, their lives, their liberties and estates? If formerly they, or their predecessors rather, have been so imprudent as to be gulled by the plausible pretences and promises of the *Presbyterians*, I hope now they have acquired some Wit by their past calamities.

Yet in one thing, I must confess, I cannot well excuse them from the censures of many judicious men, who admire what may be their reason to suffer so many mutineers and seditious fellows publickly to vent among them their pernicious and pestilent Scriblings, which enflame the Short-sighted Vulgar against the *Government* both Spiritual and Temporal, to the unspeakable reproach of the whole *City*, and imminent danger of the three *Kingdoms*.

It was wisely observed by that ancient Author *Arnobius*, adverſ. Gentes, c. 4. *Whosoever suffers sinners to sin, addeth strength to their baldness.* And *Seneca*, in *Troade* act 2. *Qui non vetat peccare, cum possit, jubet.* And before them no less judiciously delivered by the great *Statesman Cicero*, who orat. in Pisonem saith: *It is not much different, especially in a Consul or Magistrate, whether he vexeth the Commonwealth himself by pernicious Laws and tumultuous Speeches, or suffers others to do it.* What shall we say then of these *Magistrates*, whose duty and office it is to examine such matters, and who daily hear and see the pestilent scriblings of the *Presbyterians*, poysoning the blind rabble with their *Seditious* Libells and Pamphlets (very ominous indeed to this *Kingdom*, if we remember 41.) yet do seldom or never enquire after those factious Spirits, but seem rather in a great proportion, either through fear or love, to countenance their insolency, which is already come to that height, that it is altogether intolerable? for tho' the dissembling *hypocrites* pretend to write against the *Papists*, yet insensibly they fall from thence to rail against our *Bishops* and learned *Clergy*, not without

open

open hints and reflections upon his Sacred Majesties Person and Government. Their writing against the *Papists* is onely to colour their cursed designs, and if they can but fill our senses with the horrour of the *Popish Plot*, and daily bring us new *alarms* of the *Papists* treacheries against us, and thereby make us wholly intentive and bent against that Party, their work is done. They are sure to carry on their own designs with such dexterity and smoothness in so fair an opportunity, that insensibly they may surprise and destroy us. I think therefore in my conscience, it is our interest now so to beware of the plotting *Papists*, that yet we may have a vigilant eye over the treacherous *Presbyterians*, and narrowly sift and examine their proceedings and pretences, lest at last we find a *Snake* in the grass, as dangerous as that of the *Rump-Parliament*, whose steps our *modern Presbyterians* seem exactly to follow.

Let not the name of *Protestants*, or *reformed Christians*, nor yet the smalness of our differences in *Religion*, promise us any security from these unsociable *Gospellers*, since we have so lately seen, how the holy Brethren had no sooner overthrown the *common Enemy*, the *Church* of *England*, but they presently fell by the ears among themselves, one *Faction* endeavouring to suppress and destroy the other. So that what the Lord threatned to inflict upon the *Egyptians*, the same he exactly fulfilled in these pretended *Reformists*, *I will set the Egyptians against the Egyptians, and they shall fight every one against his brother, and every one against his neighbour, City against City, and Kingdom against Kingdom, Isa.* 19. 2. But if the *Dependent Presbyterians* were so eager against the *Independents*, who no less than the former stood for the *Presbyterian Discipline*, and differed from them onely in some small Formalities of *Church-Government*, is it possible they should be faithful to the *Church* of *England*, whose Communion they openly censure as *Popish* and *Antichristian*? Do not we see even in these present times, when we have the Sovereign Authority, and all the Laws of the Land against them, with what stratagems never theless they stop the mouths of his Majesties Loyal and Orthodox Subjects? They know, nothing can be more odious to *Protestants* than *Popery* and *Popish Superstitions*; nor to a Freeborn *English Subject*, than *Tyrannical* and *Arbitrary Government*; and whosoever is found endeavouring to introduce either of these two Monsters into this Kingdom, he must undoubtedly be reputed a sworn enemy to the People of *England*. Wherefore because these *Puritans* chiefest aim and design is, to crush both *Monarchy* and *Episcopacy* under the *Cloak* of *Presbytery*: this plausible pretence they use with such wonderful dexterity, as a two-edged Sword against all their

adversaries and opposers. For if any has the courage to speak in defence of his *Majesty*, or his present *Government*, he is immediately cried down as one disaffected to the *Liberties* of the *English* Nation; nay, as an introducer of *Tyrannical* and *Arbitrary Government*; and then, *God* be merciful to his Soul, for nothing but his downfall must satisfie these bloody *Canibals*. And likewise whosoever presumes to speak for the *Church of England*, or stand in her defence against the *Schismatical Sectaries*, he is presently cri'd down for a *Papist*, or at least *Popishly* inclin'd, and so exposed to the fury of the blinded Rabble, like those innocent *Christians*, exposed by the Tyrant *Nero* to the fury of his Dogs, in the skins of Bears and other savage Beasts; though it is evident to all the world, no Party can be apter to introduce *Papists* and *Popery*, if they find it for their advantage, than the *Presbyterians* themselves.

We cannot surely forget how earnestly the *Scottish Presbyterians*, and particularly the Lord *Lowdon*, and others of the chief Confederates of that *Kingdom*, in the year 1639, courted the *French King* to favour their proceedings, and grant them his assistance against their *natural Sovereign*. We know what sway *Cardinal Richlieu*, the *French Kings* great Minister of State, bore among these holy *Gospellers*, (who yet pretended to fight for Religion) sending his own *Chaplain* and a number of his chiefest *Jesuits* into *Scotland*, to foment the differences, and exasperate the *Rebels* there. See *Bakers Chron. page* 489.

How then do we know, but they are swayed by the same Faction even at this present time, and endeavouring to open the Sluces for *Popery*, though they cry Whore first against the *Church* of *England*? Certain it is, the *French King* has now also many active Emissaries to promote his designs, and we may easily guess, it is not the least of his thoughts to inflame this *Kingdom* into a total combustion; neither can he excogitate fitter instruments for his purpose than those *fiery Spirits*, who are, as it were, born to *embroil Kingdoms*, and, like *Ishmael*, *to have their hand against every man, and every mans hand against them*, *Gen.* 16. 12.

But they are the most inveterate against the *French King* and his *interest*, how then can they be inclin'd to promote his *designs*? They are indeed *inveterate* against him in *some particulars*, but in *others* they joyntly concur; both *Parties* are agreed to *divide* and *inflame* this *Kingdom*, and thereby sacrifice it, the one to his *Tyranny*, and the other to his *Anarchical Democracy*. And this was the reason why the *Presbyterians*, in their late grand Rebellion, so much courted the *French* to their assistance against King *Charles* the first. The truth

is,

is, they are ſo eagerly bent upon the *aboliſhing* of *Monarchical Government* here, that to accompliſh their deſires, they would not ſcruple to ſay with that curſed *Sorcereſs*,

Flectere ſi nequeo ſuperos, Acheronta movebo.

Monarchy is a ſting that continually galls them, and the onely *yoke* (beſides *Epiſcopacy* and *Gods Commandments*) they think inſupportable and inconſiſtent with their *Chriſtian*, or rather *Antichriſtian Liberty*. To be rid therefore of this *bondage*, we need not doubt, they will leave no ſtone unremoved, no villany unattempted. Yet becauſe this *great Work* can hardly ever be accompliſhed, except firſt the *very foundation* of the *preſent Government* be vigorouſly ſhaken, and the *whole frame* put out of joynt, by making this *Kingdom* of an *Hereditary* to become an *Elective Monarchy*, they uſe all poſſible arts and artifices to exclude the *right Heir* to the *Crown*, and raiſe a *King* of their own making, who has no better *Title* to the *Sovereignty* than the *meaneſt* of themſelves, to the end that by what *Power* they ſhould *create* him, they might alſo *annihilate* him at their pleaſure, and thereby baniſh all *Monarchical Government* (and *Epiſcopacy* they are ſure muſt conſequently vaniſh) out of this *Iſland* for ever.

For the *Perſon* they now pretend ſo much to *idolize*, they know is neither of *parts ſufficient* to countermine their *contrivances*, nor of *intereſt* able to oppoſe their *commands*, whenſoever they would be pleaſed to call him to an account, with a *Redde rationem villications tuæ*, and cauſe him (as formerly they did to *Richard Cromwel*) to come *cap in hand* to his Maſters, and acknowledge their *Sovereignty*; in the interim, he muſt be reputed the onely *Demi-god* of the *Fanatical Republicans*, who, in *Abſolom's* language, whiſpering in the Peoples ears, delude the ſhort ſighted Vulgar with a *parturiunt montes* of thoſe *golden days* they promiſe them are near at hand.

Poſtquam, Saturno *tenebroſa in tartara miſſo*,
Sub Jove *mundo erit.*
Vivat at ad multos Carolus *Philadelphius annos.*

Yet againſt theſe and ſuch other *Serpentine ſuggeſtions*, I think it is a ſufficient Antidote for any man of *common ſenſe*, to call to mind what a *deluge of miſeries* have ſince the *Conqueſt* hapned in this *Iſland*, by the means of ſome *ambitious* and *aſpiring Spirits*. Surely it is a ſufficient *caution* for all prudent men to conſider, what an *inundation of Engliſh blood*

blood, what *cruel Massacres* of *innocent Subjects* followed the *Tyrannical Usurpation* of *King Henry* IV. though grounded on his *Predecessors Resignation*, and confirmed by *Act of Parliament*, as the Learned Bishop of *Carlisle* judiciously foretold, and as magnanimously endeavoured to prevent. And to come to matters of later date, and no less to our purpose, certainly the *dismal combustions* occasioned in *Scotland* by the wicked Earl of *Murray* alone, should be warning enough for all ensuing Ages; this man, though but *Bastard Son* to *King James* V. yet alledged his Mother was married to the King, and thereby pretended a *Title* to the *Crown*, which to snatch from Queen *Mary* of *Scotland*'s Head, first opened a sluce to the *Genevesian Incendiaries*, who upon a sudden so infected the People with *Puritanism*, and consequently with the spirit of *Anarchy* and *disobedience*, that they could never since be fully reduced to a due temper of *Reformation*, or firm *Loyalty*; and then he raised almost the whole *Kingdom* in open *Rebellion* against their *Sovereign*, though at last, through the just judgment of God, to his *own ruine* and *destruction*.

Shall we therefore be so imprudent, as to *connive* or *approve* of the like *proceedings now*, contrary to his *Majesties* expres will, contrary to the safety both of himself and all his *Subjects*, and withall contrary to all *Laws* both *Humane* and *Divine*? Shall we forsake the *true Temple of God*, and go *worship* the *Golden Calf of Jeroboam*? exclude the *Right Heir* to the *Crown*, and set up an *Idol*, chosen by *Fanaticks*, not for any love to his Person, nor his Policy or Prudence in State-affairs, nor yet for his Zeal for Religion, but meerly to make a *Tool* of him to drive on their own mysterious designs, and thereby undo both himself and the whole Nation before he is aware of their contrivances; to which purpose, the *hypocritical Zealots* do so applaud and extoll him daily, as if he had been the *spring* of all our *happiness*, (God send the *Puritans* make him not the contrary, to his *own* and *others ruine*) and the onely hopes of the *three Kingdoms*.

But of his *R. H.* they give such strange and monstrous *representations*, that it is unconceivable to any, not acquainted with the *Presbyterians*, what the malice of man can do: Nothing but Queen *Mary's days*, nothing but *Fire and Faggot* must serve their turn, to frighten the poor people out of their *little wits*, and make them believe they are already at the Stake in *Smithfield*. And to what purpose is all this? Why, they know his *R. H.* is of that profound Wisdom, and Heroick Spirit, that it is impossible for them to *out-reach* or *out-wit* him in any of their *Antimonarchical undertakings*, nor yet impose upon his *Sacred Majesty*, while his *R. H.* is near at hand to dissipate the Rebellious counsels

Councels of ſuch *Abitophels*. And becauſe they perceive there is no aſperſion more odious among *Proteſtants*, nor more difficult to be wiped off, than the imputation of *Popery*; this charge the *Fanaticks* moſt eagerly preſs againſt his *R. H.* purpoſely to bring him into an *Odium* with the people; nay, they muſt have it for granted, and he cannot be half reformed that will deny it, tho' grounded upon the moſt ſilly and moſt groundleſs ſuſpicions imaginable, without any colour or appearance of prooff, beſides the *Presbyterians durbs ipſa*.

Becauſe his *R. H.* to maintain his priviledg and prerogative above ordinary *Subjects*, refuſed to take the Oaths of *Allegiance* and *Supremacy*, as being never intended to be tendred to any of the *Royal Family*, whoſe birth is a greater tie of their fidelity to the *Crown*, than any Oath the wit of man can invent, he muſt preſently be reputed a *Papiſt*, and thereby expoſed to the *malice* and *hatred* of the *mobile*. But do not the *Presbyterians* alſo reject theſe *Oaths*? how then can it be an argument of *Popery* in the *D.* to refuſe them? Can it be reputed *Popery* in the one, and *Puritaniſm* in the other? Or if the *Papiſts* and *Puritans* have two diſtinct reaſons to refuſe theſe *Oaths*, why might not his *R. H.* have a third motive, diſtinct from both, to reject them?

Oh! but he does not *Communicate* with the *Church* of *England*. And no more do the *Presbyterians*. Muſt we therefore conclude they are *Papiſts* too? We muſt indeed conclude they are infected with the very dregs of *Popery*, as *Treaſon*, *Rebellion*, and *Kingkilling* principles. And I am confident, the chiefeſt reaſon why they are ſo inveterate againſt the *Papiſts*, is not for any diverſity of Religion, but rather becauſe *two of a Trade cannot agree*. *Figulus odit figulum*, and ſo very often one *Traytor* hates another.

As for his *R. H.* tho' of late he communicates not with the *Church* of *England*, yet we cannot find that ever he communicated with the *Church* of *Rome* either in *Doctrine* or *Sacraments*. Upon what grounds then can we conclude him a *Papiſt*? And ſince *Chriſtianity* commands us to think the beſt we can of all perſons, and that it is undeniably better to communicate with no *Church* at all, than with one confeſſedly erroneous; becauſe the one is but to omit what is good, but the other is poſitively to commit what is evil; the one is againſt an affirmative precept, which doth not bind us for all times and ſeaſons, the other againſt a negative which doth always oblige: Is it not more *Charitable* in us, to think his *R. H. Communicates* with no *Church* at all, than raſhly affirm, without any grounds, he *Communicates* with the *Church* of *Rome*? Eſpecially, ſince it cannot be denyed, but that a man may for a time ſuſpend his *Communion* as to the *Sacraments*, and

out-

outward *Ceremonies* from all visible *Churches*, and yet be a true *Christian* still. Shall we be so mad as to imitate the profane *Puritans*, who spare neither the prerogatives of God, nor of Gods vicegerent but arrogantly presume to dive into peoples hearts (which are subject only to the divine omniscience) and without any appeal to their actions, pretend to know their most inward secrets?

Let us rather endeavour to dive into the *Presbyterians mysterys of iniquity*, and by their outward actions we may easily guess their inward designs. *Ex operibus eorum cognoscetis eos.* There you shall plainly find, it is neither for any *Zeal* for the *Protestant Religion*, nor for any good they wish the *Church* of *England*, they charge his *R. H.* with *Popery*, or use such Virulent invectives against him, but meerly out of their boundless malice and antipathy against *Monarchical Government*. And in proof hereof, I durst venture my life, had the matter been wholly left to the *Presbyterians* choice, they would rather wish his *R. H.* should openly profess the *Romish Religion*, than now declare himself to be, or rather still to have been of the *Church* of *England*: the former they know might be a specious *Cloak* for their *Knavery*, but the latter, would deprive them of their most plausible pretences. Besides, they cannot deny, but that his *Majesty* is as likely to survive his *R. H.* as otherwise: if therefore their design had been only to secure the *Protestant Religion*, as they pretend, to what purpose should they (had the *D.* been really a *Papist*) so much exclaim against a *Popish Successor* who is likely either not at all, or at least not long to survive his Sacred *Majesty*; and consequently, is not like to be able, tho' he were willing, in so short a time to suppress a Religion (to speak nothing of Gods providence) so unanimously professed, and so firmly established by Law?

Their reason without doubt is, because they find themselves altogether unable to oppose his *Majesties Prerogative* and *Soveraign* Authority, joyned with the great *Conduct* and *Resolution* of his *R. H.* and therefore observing that *Machiavilian Maxim* of the *Jesuits*, *Divide & impera*, what joyntly they cannot overthrow, they labour severally to undermine. To this end they use all possible devices to possess his *Majesty* with jealousies and sinister apprehensions, thereby to alienate his affections from his only Brother, contrary to the ties not only of Nature, but also of common Gratitude to a person of his merits and services both at home and abroad; and whom God has joyned together these *Republicans* labour to put asunder.

How fatal this Stratagem proved in King *Edward* the *6ths* days to the great *D.* of *Somerset* and his brother the *L. Admiral*, our *Historians* can

can ſufficiently teſtifie. Theſe two, while united amongſt themſelves, like a triple Cord, were ſo ſtrong, and ſeemed ſo formidable to their adverſaries, that it was concluded nothing but their ſeparation could put a period to their ſo much envyed greatneſs. Their enemies therefore by ſtrange artifices prevailed at laſt with the *Protector*, who during the *Kings* minority had the chief management of affairs, to ſubſcribe to his brothers execution, but thereby condemned his own head to the *Block*, as ſoon after he found too true by woful experience For being thus left alone, he was preſently expoſed to the implacable malice of his bloud thirſty adverſaries, and not having now his brother to eſpouſe his quarrel, he was at laſt ſacrificed to their fury. *A warrant* (ſaith *Baker*, ſpeaking of the *Admiral*'s untimely death) *was ſigned under the hand of his brother the* Protector, *to cut off his brothers head.* Whereby (at it proved) he did as much as if he had laid down his own head to the *Block*: for whilſt theſe brothers lived and held together, they were as a ſtrong Fortreſs one to the other; the *Admiral*'s Courage ſupporting the *Protector*'s Authority, and the *Protector*'s Authority maintaining the *Admiral*'s Stoutneſs; but the *Admiral* once gone, the *Protector*'s Authority, as wanting ſupport, began to totter, and fell at laſt to utter ruine. Beſides, there was at this time, among the Nobility, a kind of Faction; *Proteſtants*, who favoured the *Protector* for his own ſake; and other of the *Papal* inclination, who favoured him for his brothers ſake: but his brother being gone, both ſides forſook him, even his own ſide as thinking they could expect little aſſiſtance from him, who gave no more aſſiſtance to his own brother. Hitherto *Baker*, page 307.

And we may be ſure, this Stratagem proving then ſo ſucceſsful, cannot but animate our *Machiavels* now to uſe the like contrivance, to carry on their helliſh deſigns againſt our *King* and *Kingdom*. They have often declared of late years in their *Clubs* and grand *Cabals*, that if they could but once be rid of his *R. H.* they might make what they pleaſed of his Sacred *Majeſty*: And truly, in my opinion, they had reaſon to expect no leſs: for ſurely, no man can be ſo blind, as not to ſee, that if the *King* ſhould at any time give way to the *Presbyterians* unlimited malice againſt the *D.* and particularly to the Spirit of revenge which now agitateth their chiefeſt *Demagogues*, not one of all his friends but would immediatly deſert him, and for their own preſervation leave him to the mercileſs mercy of the *Antimonarchical Republicans*; as formerly it happen'd to the D. of *Somerſet*,

Si licet exemplis parvis in grandibus uti.

The reaſon is, becauſe they could not in prudence expect any ſafety or ſecurity from him, who (to ſatisfie an unſatiable Faction, which as King *James* ſaid, no favour or obligation can win) would not ſecure ſo good and ſo deſerving a brother againſt ſo apparent a malice, which plainly tends to the utter ſubverſion of all Government both *Spiritual* and *Temporal*.

To this our *Abitophels* will anſwer, "That as for their part they "never conſpired againſt his R. *H.*'s life, neither did they aime at any "thing elſe, but the preſervation of the *Proteſtant Religion*, and the "*Property* and *Liberty* of the Subject; and to this end tho' they endea-"voured to diſinherit his *R. H.* yet they never deſigned to take away his life. Yet this is but *crambe recocta*, and the old *Canting* of 41. and withal it is the Spirit of *Popery* under the Cloak of *Presbytery*. Firſt, it is well known that by theſe very pretences the *Godly Goſpelers* ſeduced the ignorant people from their *Allegiance* to the *Father*, as now they endeavour to incenſe them againſt the *Son*. It is the uſual policy of theſe *Machiavels* (like him who often transforms himſelf into an *Angel* of light, 2 *Cor.* 11. 14.) to make fair beginnings, but very foul endings. Their ſpecious pretences are like the ſinging of *Syrens*, lulling the unwary into ſuch a ſleep, that he is not able to eſcape the ſnares of their malice. Secondly, this artifice exactly reſembles that cunning diſtinction of ſome *Papiſts*, who ſay that the *Pope* may Authorize Subjects to depoſe, but never to kill or murder their *Soveraign*; whereas it is manifeſt, that whoſoever can juſtly depoſe, he may lawfully put to death any *Prince* whatſoever; and what cauſe ſoever grounds the one, muſt of neceſſity juſtifie the other. Nay, a *Prince* is no ſooner diſinherited or depoſed, but he is *ipſo facto* alloted for a Sacrifice to his enemies. Private perſons may, but it is impoſſible for *Princes* to ſurvive their Dignity. K. *Richard* the 2*d.* having ſo freely reſigned his *Crown* made (as he thought) firm conditions with *H.* the 4*th* peaceably to lead a private life; yet this could not in the leaſt ſecure him, or prevent his *Tragical* execution. The like happen'd to *Edward* the 2*d.* *Henry* the 6*th* and many others: nay, to ſee a *Prince* (if *compos mentis*) in ſafety after his diſinheriſon or depoſition, is

Rara avis in terris, nigroq; ſimillima Cygno.

But ſuppoſe the *D.* might ſurvive his diſinheriſon, upon what grounds ſhould he thus forfeit his Dignity, or be deprived of his *Birth-right*? Is it, becauſe he is a *Non-Conformiſt*? If ſo, then let all *Puritans*, who undoubtedly are *Non-Conformiſts* and *Schiſmatical* Sectaries

ctaries, firſt be expelled out of their Lands and Livings, out of their places and employments, that ſo there may be ſome grounds to proceed againſt the *D.* Ay, but he is ſuppoſed a *Papiſt*, and conſequently cannot be a good *K.* for *Proteſtant* Subjects. Why then, at leaſt let all ſuppoſed *Papiſts* firſt forfeit their eſtates, and then we may once more ſtrive for the *Biſhops* Lands, and ſend them to the *Pope* for a penſion. Beſides, if the *Papiſts* whether ſuppoſed or real be thus dealt withal, why ſhould not the ſame meaſure be meted to other *Sectaries* alſo, as to *Quakers*, *Brownifts*, *Anabaptiſts*, who are no leſs erroneous in their Doctrine, nay, and to the *Presbyterians* too, who are no leſs wicked in their practices, than the *Papiſts* themſelves. And ſurely we have already found by experience, that it is far more impoſſible for *Presbyterians* to make good Subjects for any *Monarch* whatſoever, than for a *Papiſt* to make a good *K*, for *Proteſtant* Subjects. If therefore the *D.* (who is only ſuppoſed, but never proved a *Papiſt*) ſhould forfeit his right, becauſe of the repugnancy of *Popery* to the *Proteſtant Religion*; let the *Puritans* (who are known *Schiſmaticks* and rebels to the *Church*) firſt be deprived of all their Livings and Employments, becauſe of the undoubted *Antipathy* of *Presbytery*, as well to true *Religion*, as to *Monarchical* Government. Is it not madneſs in the higheſt degree, that known *Sectaries* ſhould be tolerated, and the ſuſpected only be cenſured or condemned? that the ſon of our late *Soveraign*, who dyed a *Martyr* for our *Church*, ſhould be threatened to looſe his right, and and the worthy Sons of his bloudy *Butchers* be left in quiet poſſeſſion of thoſe Lands, which their Fathers Villanies and their own Wickedneſs made them unworthy to enjoy? Shall we be again deluded by their ſpecious pretences, to make the *Crown* a Foot-ball for *Republicans*? Is this our *Oath* to maintain the prerogatives of the *Crown* with the hazard of our lives, to leave it thus to the enemies of *Monarchy* to beſtow it on whom they pleaſe? If we look unto former ages, we ſhall find that the Succeſſion was then held ſo Sacred and inviolable, that it was counted a crime of the firſt magnitude for Subjects to meddle in ſuch weighty matters.

That glorious Princeſs Q. *Eliz.* tho' a Woman, yet never heard the Succeſſion debated, even againſt a profeſſed *Papiſt*, either in or out of *Parliament*, but the actors muſt preſently pack to priſon to conſider and amend their Folly: For (as *Cambden* ſaith in her Life, p. 73.) *certainly, ſhe never heard any thing more unwillingly, than that the title of Succeſſion ſhould be called into queſtion.* And therefore in the 8. year of her Reign, ſhe ſent Mr. *Thornton* Reader of Law in *Lincolns-Inn* to the *Tower, becauſe in his Reading he called the* Q. *of* Scots *title in queſtion*, Camd.

page 86. And it was alledged by the Earl of *Leiceſter*, as a great crime againſt the Lord Keeper *Bacon, that he had intermeddled againſt the Q. of* Scots *in the matter of Succeſſion, and was privy to a Book wherein* Hales *went about to derive the title of the Crown of* England, *in caſe the Q. ſhould die without Iſſue, to the houſe of* Suffolk. *Whereupon* Hales *was commited to the Tower; But* Bacon (*though he denyed it*) *was by much adoe reſtored to favour.* Cambden page 73. And likewiſe in a *Parliament* held 35. *Eliz.* Mr. *Wentworth*, Sir *Henry Bromley* and others of the *Houſe* of *Commons*, mouing for entailing the ſucceſſion of the *Crown*, the Q was ſo much incenſed againſt them, that Mr. *Wentworth* was preſently ſent to the *Tower*, and the reſt to the *Fleet*. *Tantæ molis erat defendere Jura coronæ.*

And had this courſe been taken in theſe times with ſome over-active *Republicans*, who out of their *Antimonarchical Zeal* endeavour to ſnatch the *Crown* from the right line, I doubt not, but in few days all theſe Storms might be allayed, and things brought to a firm ſetlement; for it is certain, the more they are tolerated, the more inſolent they will grow; and if ever they get the opportunity, they will no leſs bark againſt the *Poſſeſſor*, than the *Succeſſor* of the *Crown*; for in truth notwithſtanding all hypocritical clamours of *Religion*, their main deſign is to expel both *Monarchy* and *Epiſcopacy* out of this *Iſland* for ever.

The caſe therefore being ſuch, and the *Presbyterians* ſpecious pretences proving at laſt ſo pernicious to our *Church* and *State*, have we not reaſon to look about us, and timely beware of ſuch dangerous creatures, who like *Judas* outwardly ſhew us a great deal of kindneſs, but in their hearts contrive our ruine, and under the colour of ſecuring the *Proteſtant Religion*, do labour to ſubvert our *Laws* and *Government*, and engage the three Nations in endleſs troubles? Is it not our intereſt, while we have the power in our hands, diligently to examine theſe ſpecious pretences, and if poſſible dive into the bottom of their deſigns. remembring that pithy ſaying of the *Roman* Sage, *Fiſtula dulce canit, volucrem dum decipit auceps.* We ſee how through our careleſſneſs they daily gain ground upon us, continually tampering with thoſe of our *Church*, whoſe paſſions they find ſuitable or pliable to their pretences. Such as they find ignorantly *Zealous*, or in the leaſt offended at any thing they miſunderſtand in our *Ceremonies*, by their *Hypocriſie* and ſeeming *Sanctity* they are ſure to win them to their party. And thoſe they perceive to be of an ambitious and aſpiring Spirit, they immediatly gain by rewards aand promiſes of great preferments.

But

But ſuch as they find popular and eminent above the reſt, or in a poſture to do their *Countrey* ſervice, preſently they inſinuate themſelves into their good liking, and if poſſible, inſenſibly ſteal them to their *Puritan Faction*. And ſo ſucceſsful they have been in theſe cunning contrivances, that it is not imaginable what number of *Proſelites* they have lately gained from our communion. Nay, theſe very *Witneſſes*, who happily came in to diſcover the *horrid Plot* of the *Papiſts*, are ſo courted and careſſed by the *godly Brethren*, that people make it a *grand Quære*, whether theſe *Diſcoverers* be now more inclined to the *Presbyterian intereſt*, or to the good of the *Church* of *England*. As for my own part, I muſt confeſs, this *Problem* has for above this half year paſt, often put me to a *Non-plus*, and to a great confuſion of mind, not well knowing what to conclude in theſe diſtracted times: For when I think of theſe *Witneſſes* diſcovering the curſed *Popiſh Plot*, I cannot but praiſe the *Divine Providence*, which always fruſtrates the helliſh deſigns of theſe *Sons of Belial* againſt our *Church* and *State*. But when on the other ſide I conſider, how the *Presbyterians* are the moſt intimat *Privy-Council* of theſe ſame *Diſcoverers*, their greateſt ſticklers, and chief, if not ſole Admirers and Adorers; and withall when I hear of their diſcovering the Introducers, not onely of *Popery*, but alſo of *Tyrannical and Arbitrary Government*, and that I know the *Church of England*, (which, as the moſt *Orthodox*, ſo is now the moſt *Loyal Church* upon Earth) or at leaſt all the *Courtiers*, and his *Majeſties chief Favourites*, may, in the *Puritans Judgment*, as well be charged with the later branch, as the *Papiſts* have been proſecuted for the former; yea, are in a great number already liſted by our *holy Brethren*, ſome as *Penſioners*, others plainly as *introducers* of *Arbitrary Government*, and of *Popery* too: When I conſider, I ſay, theſe ſtrange tranſactions, I ſtand amazed not knowing what to ſay in ſuch ſurprizing circumſtances. But, *From Presbyterian contrivances, and the reviving of* 41, *Good Lord deliver us.*

The chiefeſt ſhield, under the *Divine Providence*, and our *Gracious Sovereigns*, that protected us in former times from the inſolency of theſe *ſeditious Sectaries*, was the indefatigable diligence of our *Loyal* and *Orthodox Parliaments*, which, ſince the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign, have by good and wholeſome *Laws* ſecured us from all our *adverſaries*, until the fatal *Apoplexy* of 41, when the *Presbyterians*, by their ſecret contrivances, and deluding hypocriſie and pretence of *Religion*, gained ſo far upon the ignorant people, that few but *Presbyterians* were Elected *Parliament-men*. But if that Election proved then ſo fatal to our *King* and *Countrey*, what ſhall we think of theſe preſent times? Do not we ſee how the *Presbyterians* are the moſt

nume-

numerous and the ſtrongeſt Faction now in *England*, far exceeding in Men, Money, and Reſolution, not onely their own worthy Progeny, the late ſprung-up *Fanaticks*, but alſo the *Epiſcopal Proteſtants* of this *Iſland*? Since therefore the *Repreſentatives* of the *Commons* of *England* are Elected by the major vote of the People, how can we but ſuſpect that the *Presbyterians*, notwithſtanding the oppoſition of the *Orthodox* Party there, ſhall bear the ſway in the *Houſe of Commons*? What greater ſecurity then can we expect from ſuch Members now, than from their Predeceſſors in 41? Can theſe make greater demonſtrations of their integrity, or pretend more earneſtly their *Zeal* for the true *Proteſtant Religion*, and their *Loyalty* to their *Sovereign*, than their Predeceſſors have done? Do not we remember how the *Long-Parliament*, in their *Remonſtrance*, *May* 19. 1641. thus ſpeak in their hypocritical Language? *The ſervices which we deſire to perform to our Sovereign Lord the King, and to his Church and Eſtate, in proceeding for the publick peace and proſperity of his Majeſty, and all his Realms; within the preſence of the ſame all-ſeeing Deity, we proteſt to have been, and ſtill to be the onely end of all our counſels and endeavours, wherein we have reſolved to continue freed and enlarged from all private aims, perſonal reſpects, or paſſion whatſoever.* Likewiſe in their Declaration, *Aug.* 1. 1642. *We the Lords and Commons are reſolved to expoſe our lives and fortunes for the defence and maintenance of the true Religion, the Kings Perſon, Honour, and Eſtate.* And *July* 12. *Reſolved, That an Army ſhall be forthwith raiſed for the ſafety of the Kings Perſon, defence of both Houſes of Parliament, and thoſe who have obey'd their Orders and Commands, and preſerving the true Religion, the Laws, Liberties, and Peace of the Kingdom.* See theſe and many ſuch other expreſſions, related by Mr. *Fowlis* in his Hiſtory of the Plots and Conſpiracies of the pretended holy Saints, *Circa med.*

What more ſolemn Proteſtations than theſe could people deviſe, to demonſtrate their Integrity and Loyalty? and yet what deſtructive deſigns lay in *Ambuſcado* under theſe ſpecious maſks of *Presbytery*, I think now the world can tell. What ſtrange ſtratagems and cunning devices they uſed, until they got the power and ſtrength of the Kingdom into their own hands? Then ending their *Maſquerade*, they openly ſhewed themſelves, and, like *blood-thirſty Hell hounds*, never reſted, until they ſacrificed their *Natural Sovereign*, and baniſhed his preſent Majeſty from his *Crown* and *Dignity*. And yet ſo curſedly impenitent were the *Anarchical* Rebels, that even when the Secluded Members were reſtored by the Noble *General Monck*, and about the latter end of *February*, 1660, met in their full Parliament, ſo far they were

were from being touch'd with the leaſt remorſe of conſcience, that in *March* following they approved of theſe inhumane tranſactions, and ordered, that no perſon ſhould be admitted for an *Officer* in the *Militia*, till he proteſted as followeth, *I do acknowledge and declare, That the War undertaken by both Houſes of Parliament in their defence, againſt the Forces raiſed in the name of the late King, was juſt and lawful, and that Magiſtracy and Miniſtry are the Ordnances of God.* See *Bakers Chronicle, page* 716. *Presbyterian Magiſtracy* and *Miniſtery* forſooth muſt be the *Ordnances of God*, and *Monarchical* and *Epiſcopal Government* the *Ordnances* of Man.

And thus we ſee how miraculous his Majeſties moſt happy *Reſtoration* has been, when by the over-ruling Providence of *God*, and the glorious endeavours of *General Monck*, he was, notwithſtanding all his oppoſers, in the latter end of *May* following, ſetled in his Fathers Throne, to the unſpeakable joy of all his Loyal Subjects, and utter confuſion of his Rebellious Enemies.

But though the intoletable inſolence of the *Presbyterians* makes people apprehend theſe fears and jealouſies of ſome of their *Repreſentatives*, yet we always hope better things of the prudent conſultations of that Loyal and Honourable *Senate*. 'Tis very ſurpriſing indeed, and I am afraid no leſs ominous, that notorious *Rumpers* ſhould be the moſt earneſt of the whole *Kingdom* for the ſitting of the *Parliament*; that *Arch-Rebels* and *Regicides*, or at leaſt their Sons and Heirs, (of whom we may juſtly ſay, *Mali corvi malum ovum*) ſhould be the greateſt promoters of Petitions to his Majeſty for that purpoſe. For ſurely it can portend no good to the *Proteſtant Religion*, that *Schiſmatical Sectaries*, who in former times crept into holes, not daring to appear at the meeting of Parliaments, ſhould now be ſo earneſt for their ſitting.

Tempora mutantur, nos & mutamur in illis.

But, what may be the reaſon why the *Presbyterians* do now preſs with ſuch vehemence the ſitting of the *Parliament*, is indeed very hard and *myſterious* to conceive, yet divers do diverſly gueſs and conjecture at it, as they are diverſly inclined, for *unus quiſq; judicat prout affectus eſt.* Some think they have no other reaſon, but that being ſuch reſtleſs ſpirits, and as it were naturally enclined to breed and foment troubles, they endeavour to be *Ring-leaders* in all tumultuous and ſeditious proceedings. Others are perſwaded, that their great *Engineers* do apprehend the *Parliament* may chance ſmell out their wicked contrivances, and ſo reward them according to their deſerts; and becauſe they know they

they are for the ſitting of the *Parliament*, the more his *Majeſty* has reaſon to defer their meeting, knowing that from the *Anarchical Presbyterians* no good is to be expected; they endeavour to hinder the *Parliaments* meeting by their clamorous Petitioning for their ſitting; even as the King of *Spain*'s Daughter, hearing her Father ſwear he would do nothing that ſhe then begg'd at his hands, hindered the execution of the *Archbiſhop* of *Toledo*, by begging of his *Majeſty* to put him to death. But others are yet of opinion, their chiefeſt reaſon is, that they preſume the *Parliament*, or at leaſt the houſe of *Commons*, will ſtand for the *Presbyterian Goſpel*, and again endeauour to erect the *Geneveſian Diſcipline* in this *Kingdom*; and if they have but the houſe of *Commons* of their ſide, they doubt not, but by ſeditious *Stratagems* and continual clamours of their *property* and *liberty*, the great *Diana* of the *Epheſians*, they may force the houſe of *Lords*, and at laſt the *King* himſelf to ſubſcribe to their demands. *Deus omen avertat.*

Yet ſuch is the aſſured confidence we always repoſe in the prudence and conduct of our *Gracious Sovereign*, and in the *Religious Loyalty* of his moſt Honourable Houſe of *Lords* and *Privy Council*, that with the help of the All-ſeeing Providence of the *Almighty*, we ſhall have a moſt happy deliverance from all the contrivances of our enemies, whether *Papiſts* or *Presbyterians*. We are fully perſwaded, that as the Noble *Peers* of this *Realm* do unqueſtionably derive all their Power and Priviledges from the *Royal* Fountain; ſo now they will not drain the Stream by forſaking the Source, as formerly their Predeceſſors have moſt imprudently done, to their unſpeakable loſs and diſcredit; but will conſtantly adhere to their *Prince*, and with their accuſtomed magnanimity ſecond his *Majeſty* in protecting and defending the *Church* of *God*, as by the fundamental *Laws* of the *Land* he engageth himſelf to do, from all the incurſions of her adverſaries.

It has been King *James* his *Aphoriſm*, and lately verified by woful experience, *No Biſhop No King*; and now I think we may add, *No King No houſe of Lords*: for by the obſervation of ſo many ages we find moſt infallibly, how the intereſt of this humane *Trinity* is ſo inſeparable, that the one can never be preſerved without the ſafety and welfare of the reſt. Streams may as well keep their courſe after the Spring or Fountain is dryed up, as the *Lords Spiritual* and *Temporal* can ſubſiſt without the *Royal Fountain* of their *Sovereign:* And an *Eagle* may as well fly without his Wings, as the *King* of *England* can preſerve his *Regal* Authority, without his *Lords* as well *Spiritual* as *Temporal*. This *Kingdom* is like a *Watch*, the *ſpring* whereof is the *Prince*, the *Lords Spiritual* and *Temporal* the ballance, and the *Commons* are the interjacent

Wheels;

Wheels; the whole Frame is to be kept in due order, or elſe no regular motion is to be expected. We hope therefore, if peradventure the *Presbyterians* ſhould at any time bear the ſway in the houſe of *Commons* (which God in his goodneſs forbid) yet they ſhall never be able either to introduce *Presbytery*, or again aboliſh *Epiſcopal Government*, which has been one of the chiefeſt means of preſerving this *Kingdom* in its due temper and motion theſe many hundred years. Otherwiſe, I think, we ſhould inceſſantly pray, that no *Parliament* ſhould meet in our days.

But, Good God! what a pitty it is, that our Wiſe and Religious *Law-makers*, which through the extraordinary bleſſing of the *Almighty*, have eſtabliſhed the *Church* of *England* in its *Apoſtolical Purity*, were ſo far overſeen, as not to contrive ſome means, whereby to prevent all theſe dangers and troubles, and ſecure our *Church* from all future occurrences; which they might eaſily do, had they but made *Sectaries* and *Non conformiſts* uncapable of ſitting in our *High Court* of *Parliament*.

I muſt confeſs, had the *Presbyterian Zealots* been conſtant to their own Principles, our *Law-makers* have pretty well endeavoured to exclude them from Voting in the Houſe of *Commons*, when they ſtrictly enjoyned all the Members of that Honourable Houſe ſolemnly to take the Oaths of *Allegiance* and *Supremacy*; both which, at leaſt the latter, the world knows is directly repugnant to the *Geneveſian Goſpel*. *Such an Headſhip* (ſaith *Alexander Henderſon*, a notorious Ringleader of that Party) *as the Kings of* England *have claimed, and ſuch a Supremacy as the Two Houſes of Parliament crave, with the Appeals from the Supreme Eccleſiaſtical Judicature to them, as ſet over the Church in the ſame line of ſubordination, I do utterly diſclaim*; in his ſecond Paper to our Royal Martyr, in the Book entituled, *Reliquiæ Carolinæ*, *page* 334. Yet ſo rare is the Zeal of theſe politick *Religionaries*, and ſuch is the ſtoutneſs of their *tender conſciences*, that to get themſelves into that ſtation, wherein they are capable of promoting the *good old Cauſe*, I do not think there is any Teſt or Oath imaginable, which they would ſcruple to ſwallow. Of them we may ſay with *Horace*, *Sat.* 3. *lib.* 2.

——— *Mille adde catenas,*
Effugiet tamen hæc ſceleratus vincula Proteus.

For we find by experience, they make no conſcience of breaking, why then of taking any Oath whatſoever. Of Oaths they make poli-

tick *Engines* to drive on their designs, and delude the Rabble with their dissembling Protestations; whence we may perceive with how much reason and truth the Learned Bishop of *Chichester* affirmed, That *many be arrant Puritans in heart, that onely for preferment do conform; hold with the Hare, and run with the Hound; who, so they might vivere and valere, would as willingly have up the Presbyterian Anarchy, as would* Thomas Cartwright *were he living.* In his *Appeal to Cesar, part* 2. *c.* 1. *p.* 111. But surely since *ficta sanctitas duplex est impietas*; and as *Seneca* saith, *Malus ubi bonum simulat, tunc est pessimus*; these counterfeit *Protestants*, as they are the wickedest of Christians, so they are to be counted the most dangerous to our *Church* and *State*. I wish therefore our wise *Law-makers* had then further Enacted, That whosoever should be prov'd to neglect the service of his *Creator*, or causelessly omit to hear the Word of God, and receive the holy *Communion* from his lawful *Pastor*, or could be found to haunt *Schismatical Conventicles*, and *Illegal Meetings*, should be counted unworthy to serve his *King* and *Countrey* in our *High Court* of *Parliament*. In a word, I wish it had been ordained, that no *Sectary* or *Non-conformist* whatsoever should have the power either to choose, or be chosen, a Member of that honourable *Senate*. Had this clause been once Enacted, we might assuredly promise our selves, that no Sect or Faction should ever prevail against us; that no discord or difference should cross that loving and happy union, which has been always continued these many Ages past between our Gracious Sovereigns and their Loyal Subjects, until the *Presbyterians*, about the latter end of King *James* his Reign, most unfortunately crept into our Parliament, and infected others with the poison of their *Anarchical* Principles, which has been the source and chief original of all those unspeakable miseries that befell this distracted *Kingdom* above these 50 years; the inexhaustible fountain, whence proceeded the deluge of all our former calamities, and present apprehensions; hence our Church became gradually vilified, and at last quite rejected and suppressed as *Superstitious* and *unreformed*, our *Bishops* deposed as *Popish* and *Antichristian*, our *Divines* turned out of their *Pulpits*, *Schools*, *Colledges*, and *Universities*, and deprived of all their *Benefices* and *Livings*; our Loyal *Nobility* and *Gentry* thrust out of *Parliament*, and either cruelly murdered, or tyrannically deprived and robbed of their Lands and Means by an usurping *Nero*; and (to compleat their unparallel'd wickedness) our Gracious *Sovereign* most inhumanely murdered by these *Monsters* of Nature.

But, to make an end of this endless subject, I shall put a period to this Discourse in the words of that Learned Writer, Mr. *Foulis*, in his

his foreſaid Hiſtory, *page ult.* which now I recommend to the *Readers* ſerious conſideration: *To conclude,* (ſaith he) *if all things, according to the Poets, grow worſe and worſe, to what ſtupendious wickedneſs will the Presbyterians come? If* Caligula *ſucked blood when a Child, they might ſuppoſe him to be a cruel Monſter when a Man. If the Puritans at firſt rebel againſt, and impriſon their King, murder and clap up the Biſhops, ſeize upon their Lands, and thoſe of the Loyal Gentry, bloudily deſtroy the beſt Subjects, and careſs the wicked; if at their beginning of rule they multiplyed Religion into ſo many Hereſies, that every houſe ſeemed like that Family at the* Hague *in* Holland, *compoſed of Seven ſeveral Religions: If when they were inferiors, they durſt Proclaim the* Queen *a Traytor, call the* King's *actions Scandalous, Impudent, Falſe, Wicked, Tyrannical,* &c. *Impoſe wicked Oaths upon the Nations, and Violate all Laws. Good God! what as yet unheard of Villany and Impiety will there be invented and found out to pleaſe the Diſciplinarian palates, if ever they ſhould obtain Superiority, or have the leaſt ſway in theſe* Kingdoms? *Which no Honeſt man can deſire, all Good men are bound to oppoſe, and pray they may never have hopes of ſuch Favour and Authority.*

FINIS.

THE
Presbyterians Loyalty
AND
ZEAL for RELIGION
Demonstrated, &c.

Good Sir Presbyter,

YOur Letter I received, and have hitherto deferr'd to send you a reply, as well because I could not certainly tell where to direct it, as also because I thought it altogether needless to spend any time in answering such frivolous *impertinencies*, and idle *whimseys*; yet forasmuch as the Wise-man adviseth us *to answer the fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit*, *Prov.* 26. 5. I concluded at last to send you these ensuing Lines as a *New-years-Gift*, and direct them to your *Worship* at *Billingsgate*, where I judge by your *dexterity* in scolding and railing *Rhetorick* you are a *Master of Art*, if not *Chair-man* to that quick-tongu'd and unsociable Society.

Truly, to be railed at by the *Presbyterians*, is so far from giving me the least distaste, that I count it the greatest honour they can place upon me, it being now the common Character of a faithful *Patriot*, and true *Loyalist*: And had I been in the least prais'd by such factious Spirits, I would undoubtedly suspect my own actions, and say with *Socrates*, *What evil have I done, that these* Antimonarchical Levellers *should commend me?*

'Tis true, you pretend to be a Son of the *Church* of *England*, and to colour your *knavery*, you most unfortunately make a Cloak of that holy *Church*, whose candour and sincerity is so *transparent*, that your

pernicious designs are plainly seen through it, to the utter confusion of such *hypocritical dissemblers*.

But since the world knows, a *Protestant Jesuit* can equivocate as well as the *Puritan Papist*, I think we have reason enough to believe, that by the *Church* of *England* you mean nothing else but your own *Presbyterian Synagogue*, which alone you esteem the true *Church* of *Christ*; for it is evident, a Son of that *Church*, which is now through God's Providence established among us by the Laws of the Land, you cannot pretend to be, unless such a Son as *Nero* was to *Agrippina*, who scrupled not to procure the death of his unfortunate *Mother*, to satisfie his own monstrous voluptuousness.

You undertake to roll *Sysiphus* his Stone, or wash a *Gypsie*, to vindicate the *Presbyterians*, and make us believe they are *harmless Lambs*, though all true Protestants hold them for *ravenous Wolves*, and now apprehend them most dangerous both to *Church* and *State*: yet so pitiful a defence you make in their behalf, that I cannot tell whether the *Church* of *England* has greater reason to detest your *Schismatical* intention, than your own *Synagogue* to curse your *ill-manag'd* undertaking; for since, as the Poet well observed,

Causa patrocinio non bona pejor erit.

What shall become of an ill Cause very ill defended?

But however you fail in the rest, you are sure not to forget the old contrivances of your Predecessors, the *Parliamentarian Rebels*, and their worthy Progenitors, in charging all those with *Popery*, that presum'd to make the least opposition against their bloody *Zeal* for the *Genevisian* Reformation: Which intrigue, as it prov'd most successful to the *treacherous Rumpers*, so it has been no less destructive and pernicious to the *Church of England*, it being one of the chiefest *stratagems*, whereby the Rebels brought our *Royal Martyr* and his trustiest Ministers into an odium with the blinded Rabble.

I could instance here several passages of this *Presbyterian policy*, but I shall content my self with two or three, and will begin with one *remarkable* example, which was a *præludium* to all our former distractions, as their present proceedings, if not timely prevented, do infallibly *prognosticate* the like revolutions to be near at hand. In the year 1632. King *Charles* the First, of glorious memory, took a journey into *Scotland*, and thought by degrees to settle there the *English Liturgy*, with its usual Ceremonies; which the *Ring-leaders* of the *Presbyterian Faction* in that *Kingdom* understanding, not onely exclaimed against

our-

our *Liturgy* as *erroneous* and *ſuperſtitious*, but alſo doubted not to traduce his Majeſty for very ſtrong inclinations to the *Religion* of the *Church* of *Rome*. By which contrivance they quickly poſſeſs'd the *ſhort-ſighted Rabble* with ſuch fears and jealouſies, as afterwards broke out into a flame of open *Rebellion*, to the utter ruine and deſtruction both of *King* and *Countrey*. See *Bakers Chronicle*, *Edit. anno* 1674. *page* 473.

And ſo effectual a contrivance was this piece of policy counted by our brave *Machiavilians*, that in *England* alſo in the year 1641, when the Spirit within them mov'd the blind Zealots to joyn with the *Scotch Rebels*, (as it is recorded by the ſame Hiſtorian, *page* 535.) in the dead of the night, the more to terrifie the timorous vulgar, *they us'd to cry in the ſtreets of* London, *That all people ſhould ariſe to their defence, for the King with his Papiſts were coming to fire the City, and cut their throats in their beds. Than which contrivance* (ſaith the Author) *though nothing were more falſe, yet found the effects of truth.* Likewiſe in *Novemb.* 1642 *Vicar*, the Presbyterian Hiſtorian, in his Chronicle, *Part* 1. *page* 212. ſpeaking of the Battle of *Edge-hill*, gives this relation of his holy Brethren, *The Sabbath day after their arrival to* London, *the godly and well-affected Miniſters* (i. e. the Presbyterian Predicants) *throughout the City preached and praiſed the Lord publickly, for their joyful and ſafe return home to their Parents, Maſters, and Friends, exherting thoſe young Soldiers of Chriſts Army Royal ſtill to retain, and be forward and ready to ſhew their courage and zeal to the defence of Gods Cauſe, and their Countreys welfare: ſhewing them the Plots of their adverſaries, to have introduced Popery and Tyranny into the Kingdom; and aſſuring them, that this War on their parts was waged and managed by Papiſts, an Army of Papiſts being raiſed by the Kings command, contrary to his vows and proteſtations.*

It is needleſs, I ſuppoſe, to repeat here, how often moſt of our eminent *Divines*, and zealous *Church men*, ever ſince the *Reformation*, have been ſlandered in this manner by theſe hot-headed *Enthuſiaſts*, and compelled to make *Apologies* in their own vindication againſt ſuch wicked aſperſions. Was not the Learned **Dr.** *Mountague*, Biſhop of *Chicheſter*, forced to write a Book, intituled, *Appello Cæſarem*, againſt the malicious Calumnies of the *Puritan* Party, where the godly man ſheweth himſelf ſo far from being daunted with their bold attempts and bloody Menaces, that, with true *Chriſtian courage* he openly expoſeth to the world their *myſteries of iniquety*, and fully diſcovereth their pernicious contrivances to undermine our *Church*, and ſubvert our *Government*? and amongſt the reſt, he ſpeaketh in this manner, *The truth is, as with the Jeſuit he is an Heretick, that is not* furioſo *more a Roman*

Catholick

Catholick, ſo with the Puritan he is a Papiſt that will not run a madding with them. It is not the firſt time (ſaith he) *for this very cauſe I have been talk'd of, eſteem'd of, traduc'd as a Papiſt; which I can the better brook, becauſe they have meted this meaſure to the Church of England it ſelf, as ſympathiſing with Papiſts in her Liturgy, Diſcipline, and Doctrine.* In his *Appeal to Ceſar, part* 2. *c.* 1. *p.* 110.

All true Proteſtants therefore, who prefer the *Harmonious* and *Apoſtolical Order* and *Government* of the *Church* of *England*, before the confuſed hodge-podge of the new-found *Geneveſian Diſcipline*, have now (I think) ſufficient reaſon to beware of ſuch dangerous contrivances for the future, and not ſuffer themſelves to be gull'd again by ſuch gilded pretences, which, like the *Apples* of *Sodom*, are ſpecious indeed and beautiful without, but baſe and filthy within. The *Presbyterians*, to our ſorrow, have by this policy once deceived us, and the Lord forgive them; but if they deceive us again, then the Lord forgive us. *Improbe Neptunum accuſat, qui iterum naufragium facit.* As for my part, I declare before God and the World, that I renounce with all my heart and Soul as well the *Idolatrous Papiſts*, as the *Anarchical Presbyterians*, whoſe blind zeal and tranſparent hypocriſie, with their appurtenances, *abjuro, denego, deteſtor.*

I muſt confeſs, the Presbyterians are ſomething beyond the Papiſts in matters of *Religion*, neither did I ever compare them together in that point; but I ſuppoſed with the moſt Learned of our *Church*, and particularly with *Englands Solomon*, King *James* of glorious memory, in his *Apology* for the *Oath of Allegiance*, *page* 19. That *Papiſts* were never perſecuted in this *Kingdom* (if not by *Cromwel* and his *Rumpers*) for matters of Faith, but for their wicked Principles, and deſtructive Practices againſt *Temporal Government*. And now I appeal to the judicious Reader, if I have not ſufficiently demonſtrated in my former Paper out of the prime Authors and Founders of the *Geneveſian Goſpel*, as *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Knox*, *Buchanan*, *&c.* that the Presbyterian Principles are altogether as dangerous and deſtructive, if not more pernicious to *Temporal Government*, than that of the Papiſts themſelves. And if your Anſwer to this be not rather a plain confeſſion of the crime, than any vindication thereof, let the *Reader* judge.

Firſt, you ſay, *I am fain to go into other Countreys, as far as* Scotland *and* Geneva, *to prove the Rebellious Principles of the Presbyterians.* But, *good Sir Presbyter*, is not that enough, or are not the Presbyterians every where of the ſame *ſtamp* and *coin*? And beſides, why may it not be as good a way to prove the Principles of the *Presbyterians*, by alledging the Doctrine of the *Pope* of *Geneva*, and his chief *Incendiarites*,

as

as it is to demonſtrate the Principles of the *Papiſts*, by alledging the Doctrine of the *Pope* of *Rome*, and his approved *Emiſſaries*? But if neither of theſe reaſons be ſufficient in your *phantaſie*, do but peruſe Dr. *Bancroft* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury's Book of dangerous Poſitions*, and there you ſhall find enough even of *Engliſh Presbyterians* (though but Sucklings then) eagerly maintaining this *Anarchical Doctrine*; there you ſhall find a whole Chapter of that particular ſubject, with this Title, *The Doctrine of certain* Engliſh *Miniſters, which they learn'd at* Geneva, *and publiſhed of purpoſe to have procured the like courſe of Reformation in* England *to that in* Scotland. Behold now, *Sir Presbyter*, your *Geneveſian Goſpellers*, and thoſe *Engliſh* too, and *Engliſh* that to promote the *good old Cauſe*, would not ſcruple to deſtroy that antient and *Apoſtolical Hierarchy* of the Church of *England*, and enflame their *Native Countrey* into a total combuſtion of Sedition and Rebellion. But let us ſee whether your ſecond Anſwer be any thing leſs ridiculous or impertinent than the former. *Yet admit* (ſay you) *the Presbyterians in* England *hold the ſame Principles, put the queſtion whether were more Antimonarchical or unſafe to Government, an opinion, that Tyrants and oppoſers of God, might* (propter id) *be oppoſed by their Subjects*, &c. *or that a good King, one of the Reformed Religion, meerly for being ſuch, ſhould be depoſed, dethron'd, and murthered*, &c? But (*good Sir Presbyter*) what is more feaſible, than for a Presbyterian to make a Tyrant of what *Prince* he pleaſes? We ſee now with what dexterity he makes *Papiſts and Penſioners* of the moſt *zealous Proteſtants*, and no leſs *faithful Patriots*; and we have lately ſeen with what *Legerdemain* he made a *Tyrant* of the beſt of *Princes*. What Sovereign then can be ſecure from theſe Presbyterians, if it lies in their breaſt thus to make him either a *Titus* or a *Nero*, a clement *Prince*, or a cruel *Tyrant*? or can he think himſelf a *Sovereign*, and not rather *Tenant at will* to his own *Anarchical* Subjects? Yet you would fain perſwade us, your holy *Puritans* teach onely, that *Tyrants may be oppoſed by their Subjects*; whereas all the world can tell, how in our own days they have not onely *oppoſed*, but alſo *depoſed, dethron'd, and cruelly murdered*, not a *Tyrant*, but the moſt meek and Religious of *Sovereigns*, and that by a *formality* of Law too; a thing I never heard perpetrated by any Popiſh Subjects ſince the creation of the World, no, not by the moſt barbarous Heathens againſt the worſt of Tyrants.

As for a Kings being of the *Reformed Religion*, we know it ſignifies nothing to the Presbyterian *Zealots*, except he be of the *Geneveſian Doctrine* and *Diſcipline*; the *Church* of *England*, ſay they, *is neither hot nor cold, neither Popiſh nor Reformed*. And therefore in the Year 1648,

when the late *King* and *Parliament* were like to agree, the Presbyterian *Incendiaries* exclaimed against such proposals, untill the *Genevesian Discipline* were first established by Law. *This restitution of his Majesty* (say they) *to the exercise of his Royal power, before security had from him for settling Religion, your Lordships know by our eight desires, and otherwise, is conceiv'd by us to be inconsistent with the safety and security of Religion.* —*The bringing of his Majesty to some of his Houses in or near* London, *before satisfaction and security had from him in point of Religion, and in such other things as are necessary for the safety of the Kingdom, could not* (*as we conceive*) *but be an exceeding great discouragement and offence to the Presbyterians in England, who will conceive that the remedy is worse than the disease.* In the humble Representation of the Commissioners of the General Assembly to the Honourable Estates of Parliament, April the 28. 1648. Likewise, in the year 1649. the *Rebellious-Zealots* would not submit themselves in *Scotland* to their natural *Soveraign*, his present Majesty, except *he would by solemn Oath under his hand and seal, allow the National Covenant of* Scotland, *and the Solemn League and Covenant of* Scotland, England, *and* Ireland, *and would prosecute the ends thereof in his Royal station.* See *Baker*'s Chronicle, page 613. Tell me now, Sir *Presbyter*, are not these rare examples of your Presbyterian Loyalty to your natural Princes, and to Princes of the *Protestant Church*, and *Reformed Religion* too? But to set down exactly the true state of the question, admit (as you say, and cannot deny) the Presbyterians of *England* hold the same principles with the *Genevesian-Gospellers*; put you the question now, whether is more *Antimonarchial* or unsafe to *Government*, an *opinion* or rather a *fundamental doctrine*, that *Tyrants* and opposers of God, (*i. e.* any Prince that hinders the *growth* of *Presbyterie*) may *propter id*, be oppos'd, nay, depos'd, dethron'd, and cruelly Murder'd by their Subjects, as Presbyterians undeniably hold, and as undeniably have practis'd: or that it is *Heresie* in any *Christian* to affirm, *that a Prince may be slain or depos'd by his Subjects for any disorder or default, either in Life or Government*, as very *Eminent Papists* expressly teach; as (to omit those two *swindging Authorities*, as you call them, of the *Rhemists Commentaries*, and of the *Council of Constance*) it sufficiently appeareth by *Alphons. à Castro, lib. de hæres. in verbo* Tyran. *Dominic. à Soto*, lib. 5. *de Just. & Jur.* qu. 1. *art.* 3. and many others.

Now do you if you can, produce such another *Ecclesiastical Assembly* or *Synod*, or such eminent writers of the Presbyterian party, thus declaring it *Impious and Heretical* to believe that Subjects may Lawfully

fully depoſe or Murder their *Soveraign* upon the account of any Tyranny or *oppreſſion* whatſoever, and you will make the World have a better opinion of your Sect, than ever they had hitherto: otherwiſe, notwithſtanding all your multiplied bablings, we muſt conclude, *to give the Devil his due*, that in matter of Temporal Government, the principles of the Papiſts are far Sounder and more *Orthodox*, than the Presbyterian *Catechiſm*. As for the practiſes of the one and the other, you tell me, *could I prove my charge againſt the Presbyterians, as unexceptionably, as you can that of the Plot againſt the Papiſts, I would do ſomething indeed.* But I appeal to any man of common ſenſe, if you be not as *unexceptionably* impudent in your bold aſſertions, as the Preſbyterians are notoriouſly *Treacherous* in their pernicious practices. The bloud of our late *Martyr'd Soveraign*, and the effuſion of ſo much Proteſtant bloud in the late Civil Wars, (you ſhould ſay, *Presbyterian Rebellion*) you are ſo impudent as to plaiſter it upon the unfortunate Papiſts, without any colour or ſhew of proof, (it being plain to all the World, that in the whole Liſt of the *Regicides*, none is to be found but *notorious Presbyterians*) and withall to affirm, that the former are more evidently prov'd guilty of the *preſent Plot*, than the latter can be convicted of the *Rebellious practices* laid to their charge: whereas on the one ſide, we have but four or five perſons to ſwear this horrid *conſpiracy* againſt the Papiſts; but on the other ſide, all our *Records*, all our *Hiſtories*, nay, our own *memories*, and all the World can teſtifie the late *Tragical* tranſactions, as the inhumane Murder of our *Royal Martyr*, the effuſion of ſo much innocent bloud, the burning and pillaging of ſo many *Cities*, *Towns* and *Pallaces*, and in brief all the *Maſſacres* that have been committed, all the *Miſeries* that have happened in this *Iſland* of *Great Britain* theſe 50 years paſt, to have been wholly and ſolely perpetrated by theſe Monſters of *Chriſtianity* the *Anarchical*-Presbyterians, as well *dependent* as *independent*, as well *Scotch* as *Engliſh*, the one *beginning*, the other *ending* the *Tragedy*, the one *Selling*, the other *Killing* their *natural Soveraign* to the amazement of all the World.

Oh! how happy would they think themſelves now, had theſe villanies been as private, as the preſent conſpiracy of the Papiſts? Had we been truſting to the diſcovery of Mr. *Oats*, Mr. *Bedlow*, or the reſt, concerning theſe presbyterian treacheries, as well as the Popiſh Plot; Oh! how boldly the *Puritan-Goſpellers* would outface our witneſſes? with what black colours they would paint them, to extenuate the credibility of their informations? So far they would think the charge from being unexceptionably proved againſt them, that they would not

doubt but they might eaſily perſwade the World, nothing could be more unreaſonable, than to believe it upon the credit of ſuch inconſiderable witneſſes, tho' now againſt the Papiſts they hold them for *Delphian Oracles*. "What! (would they ſay) can it be Law, equity, or conſci-"ence, to take the oaths of ſome few deſpicable fellows, very obnoxious "to be ſuſpected of malice and corruption, againſt the lives of good and "peaceable Subjects, men of worth and known integrity? to take the "oaths of living Vagabonds, before the proteſtations of dying Chriſti-"ans? who can be ſafe, if this be admitted? or if this be juſtice, what "can be term'd injuſtice amongſt us?

In this manner, we may be ſure, or rather in far higher terms, would our *Superſanctified-Hypocrites* rail againſt theſe very Perſons, they now ſo much adore for Swearing againſt the Papiſts, had their crimes been ſo occult as to need a diſcoverer; and theſe, nay, people of greater credit, and much leſs obnoxious to exception, had come in to reveal their *Myſteries* of iniquity. The title of *His Majeſties Evidence* could not in the leaſt protect them from the ſnarling invectives of a Presbyterian. All that Papiſts now ſay of them, ſignified nothing to what the Presbyterians would then vomit againſt them. Witneſs their uſage of Mr. *Willoughby*, alias *Dangerfield*, &c. who when he pretended to diſcover a Presbyterian Plot, was preſently proclaim'd in the *Weekly Intelligences* and other *Pamphlets*, the greateſt Knave and Villain upon Earth, and called *Knight* of the Poſt, *Newgate-Bird*, and ſuch other titles of *Honour*, nay, affirmed to have been actually upon the *Pillory* for his miſdemeanours. The Title of *His Majeſties Evidence*, or his pretending to witneſs for the *King*, could nothing avail him againſt theſe *Sanctified* creatures, tho' now he is reputed among them an *Holy Proſelyte* newly inſpir'd and illuminated by the Lord. 'Tis true, he gave then (as himſelf confeſſes) but falſe informations againſt the Presbyterians, being put on that deſign either by the Popiſh party to turn the Plot upon their adverſaries, or by ſome Presbyterian *Politicians* to gain the greater credit to their new Informer, or perhaps by himſelf to gain ſuch maintenance and allowance for the future, as may keep him henceforth from the tryed puniſhments of the *Pillory*, ſeeing thoſe of the trade do thrive ſo well. There are now in the World a great number of *Foolhardy Deſperadoes*, of no Fortune, but leſs Honeſty, who think their only way to Preferment is, to run upon *deſperate courſes*, and rather than fail of an *Advancement*, to venture *Neck and all* for a Livelihood, according to that witty ſaying of the Satyriſt:

Aude aliquid brevibus Gyaris, aut carcere dignum,
Si vis eſſe aliquid; probitas laudatur & alget.

For

For as *Virgil* ſaith, ——— *Quid non mortalia pectora cogis Auri ſacra fames?* ——— In St. *Pauls* days, Godlineſs was great Gain; but to theſe, Gain is great Godlineſs: of whom we may juſtly ſay with the Poet,

Unde habeat quærit nemo, ſed oportet habere.

As for Mr. *Dangerfield*, this only I ſay, altho' he gave but falſe Informations againſt the Presbyterians, yet this was not then known to the generality of the people; and tho' it is undeniable, that ſuch a Plot might well be carried on by the Ring-leaders of that Faction, without communicating it to the Vulgar; nevertheleſs the *Puritan-Rabble* did ſo bark and ſnarl at *Dangerfield*, as if they had known by *Revelation* there was no ſuch Plot at all.

But to return from this digreſſion to our intended purpoſe, ſince reaſon comands us to preſer the unanimous conſent of the greateſt and ableſt men of our *Country*, together with all our *Hiſtories* and *Records*, and our own *experimental knowledg*, before the oaths of four or five perſons, tho' never ſo upright in their lives, or ſo poſitive and exact in their informations; and *a fortiori*, of people not ſo qualified, but obnoxious to ſeveral exceptions and ſuſpicious circumſtances, which mightily weakens their evidence, and leaves many judicious men in ſuſpence, fruſtrated of their expected ſatisfaction of having the Plot clear'd beyond all exception: ſurely, we cannot but conclude the late *Rebellion* to be far more *unexceptionably* prov'd againſt the Presbyterians, than the preſent Plot againſt the Papiſts. Not that I would in the leaſt vindicate the *Romaniſts* from thoſe horrid crimes laid to their charge, for I am fully ſatisfied they are as apt to commit any villany to advance their *Superſtitions*, as the Presbyterians are to promote *the Good old cauſe*; but to ſhew that the late *Helliſh Rebellion* of the one, is far more undeniable than the preſent *Conſpiracy* of the other.

And if your own *Conſcience* did not accuſe you of the known verity of this aſſertion, or if you thought the *Presbyterians* have not really committed theſe Helliſh abominations objected againſt them, to what purpoſe did you ſet the Act of *Oblivion*, to bring up the rear of your ridiculous *Apology*? Surely, things that never have been, could not have been forgotten. *Oblivio eſt præteritorum.* Yet you very confidently bid me *read over the ſeveral Tryals, and other pieces extant by Authority, concerning the preſent Plot, and ſee whether it be Presbyterians or Papiſts that murdered Sir* Edmundbury Godfrey; *that hired the* Ruffians *to murder his Sacred Majeſty, and to ruine both Church and State.* But I deſire you to read over the late *Narratives* of the *Rebellion* in *Scotland*, and ſee whether Presbyterians or Papiſts murdered the good

Bishop of St. *Andrews*; read over likewise the *History* of the late *Rebellion* in *England*, and see whether it be Presbyterians or Papists, that have (not hired *Ruffians* to murder, but themselves like inhumane *Traytors*, actually) murder'd our late *Soveraign*, and totally ruin'd both *Church* and *State*: and then see what you can get by the bargain, but that notwithstanding your ridiculous *Apology* the Presbyterians are still worse than the Papists, whereas the one did but design, the other have actually compleated our ruine. You tell us for strange news, they are not concern'd in the present *Plot*; and very strange it is indeed, that there should be any Plot or Conspiracy in this *Kingdom*, whereof the Presbyterians should not be the chief *Engineers*. Yet, Sir *Presbyter*, in my opinion you have no great reason to brag of your Brethrens innocence of this Popish Plot, since the world knows, they have commited greater villanies, and that in the face of the Sun, and for *Religion* too. Besides, I advise you to observe the common saying, *Lauda finem*, and tho' your *mysteries* of iniquity be not yet revealed, yet beware least before the present discovery be at an end, your Presbyterians be not found as deeply concern'd, as any Papist alive, either in this, or in another Plot of their own: for how can it be thought, that such *Politick* and active *Machiavels* should let this occasion slip, or omit the fairest opportunity they could expect of overthrowing their greatest adversaries, the one as *Idolatrous* Papists, the other either as *Popishly* inclined, or as introducers of *Tyranical* and *Arbitrary Government*? I omit here, that I have seen several reasons and arguments, very specious indeed to outward appearance, strongly insinuating that the Presbyterians are the *primum mobile* even of the present Plot, and the chief, if not the sole contrivers of all these troubles, fraudulently corrupting and suborning most of those witnesses, that came in to swear against the Papists, purposely to draw the *Kingdom* into a confusion, and thereby restore the *Cromwellian Gospel* and *Government*.

In this assertion, I know, there is no *impossibility* or *contradiction* to be found; I believe it very *feasible* (and without doubt it has been often done) to corrupt and suborn men of better credit and reputation than these witnesses have been, that have yet appeared in this discovery; and withall I am sure, the Presbyterians are too apt to commit any villany to promote the *Good old cause*: yet nevertheless, because we must not insist upon unprov'd, tho' probable suspicions, when we have enough even of plain demonstrations to prove our intended purpose of shewing how dangerous our *Puritan-Gospellers*, if not prudently and timely prevented, are to our *Church* and *State*; the probability of this charge, I leave to be weigh'd and examind by the *Judicious* Reader.

In

In the interim, tell me I beſeech you, what may be the reaſon that the Presbyterians are the activeſt and moſt eager proſecutors of the Papiſts upon the account of this Plot, and alſo the greateſt promoters and admirers of thoſe witneſſes, that appear againſt them. Are the Presbyterians the ableſt men in the *Kingdom?* or do they only apprehend the danger of this Plot? Do they love their *Religion Lives*, or *Liberties*, better than Proteſtants love theirs? or were not Proteſtants to be made away, had this Plot gon on, as well as the Presbyterians? why then are not the latter as moderate as the former, or the former as mad as the latter? Truly, I have heard ſeveral *Judicious Proteſtants* affirm, they could never believe, that the Presbyterians ſhould be ſo hot or eager in proſecuting this Popiſh Plot againſt ſo inconſiderable a party, as Papiſts now are in this *Kingdom*, except they had greater deſigns, or were more concerned in that Plot themſelves, than they would have the *World* believe. But time will tell truth.

Your ignorance tells you, I have affronted the *Clergy* of the *Church* of *England*, by calling them *Dumb-dogs*; but you ſhould know before you appeared in Print, that a *Dog*, for his natural vigilancy, is the common *Emblem* of an *Eccleſiaſtical Paſtor*; and if our *Prelates* now be leſs active than is neceſſary for to prevent your *Treacherous* deſigns, and countermine your *pernicious* contrivances againſt their Flock, they may attribute this application of *Gods word*, *Iſa.* 56. 10. not to any ill meaning of mine, but rather to their own unreaſonable careleſneſs in ſuch a deſperate juncture of times, when our greateſt, if not our only enemies, the Presbyterians and Papiſts, are equally, tho' ſeverally, bent for our deſtruction; *thoſe brethren in evil*, (as the Bithop of *Chichester* elegantly calls them) *who looking and running two ſeveral ways, do like* Samſon's Foxes *joyn together in the taile.* in his appeal to *Ceſar*, part 1 c. 4. p. 48.

Here I ſhall beg the favour of you, to ask that *Reverend Prelate*, who declared himſelf in the *Parliament* before the laſt, ſo favourable to your Sect, what does he think now of the Presbyterians, or whether in his opinion they took the *Reverend Biſhop* of St. *Andrews by the Lawn-ſleeves, or by the Throat?* Ask likewiſe the reſt of thoſe learned *Prelates*, whether the Presbyterians have *like waſpiſh Curs bark'd* at that holy man *Archbiſhop Laud*, or *like your red Dragon utterly devoured him?* Is it credible, think you, theſe eminent Divines ſhould be of ſo ſhort a memory, as to forget who ſo lately voted them out of the Houſe of Peers, barbarouſly impriſoned them in the *Tower*, ſequeſtered their Lands and Revenues, (which to an *Engliſhman* is worſe then to loſe his life) deprived them of all power and jurisdiction both Spiritual & Temporal,

and

and in fine, quite aboliſhed the whole order and *hierarchy* of that *Apoſtolical* inſtitution? or is it likely they would now *Apologize* for that faction which have lately ſo *Antichriſtianly* abuſed them? they know it is an old and true ſaying, *Veterem ferendo injuriam, invitas novam:* and I pray God, they may not find it verified in themſelves, who through their exceſive meekneſs and patience towards theſe ungrateful miſcreants, I am afraid, will encourage them once more to attempt the ſuppreſſing of this *Apoſtolical hierarchy*; which we may plainly read in their libells and pamphlets; is their main deſign. Yet notwithſtanding this, and all other eminent dangers, which daily threaten us from the Presbyterian party, you are ſo impudent, as to term your ſelf an *Epiſcopal* Proteſtant, and yet ſtrain your empty noddle in apologizing for theſe *Antiepiſcopal* Sectaries, and excuſing their *Schiſmatical* ſeparation from the *Mother Church*, thereby encouraging them to act over again their horrid villanies of 48. and ſing the ſecond part to the ſame tune.

You tell us forſooth, *they are our fellow-proteſtants, and therefore not to be reputed as enemies to our Church, but to be embraced as brethren of our Reformatoon.* Proteſtants, 'tis true, they ſtile themſelves, but falſe ones they are always reputed by our Church, as Papiſts are falſe *Chriſtians*; for (as the Apoſtle ſaith) *they are not all Iſrael, which are of Iſrael, Rom.* 9. 6. Neither are they all Proteſtants, which are called Proteſtants; many do love the name, but hate the thing: and therfore why ſhould not falſe *Proteſtants* be thought as dangerous to the true faith and worſhip of God, as falſe *Chriſtians*, I could never yet underſtand. Papiſts are but falſe *Chriſtians*, but the Presbyterians are falſe *Proteſtants*, and by conſequence they are falſe *Chriſtians* too: why then ſhould the one be counted our Brethren, and the other our Enemies? or what can we gain by this our ill-beſtowed kindneſs to the presbyterians, but to draw upon us the charge of all their monſtrous contrivances, and make our ſelves accountable for their wickedneſs, as the papiſts are now commonly charged with the horrid practices of the *Jeſuits*? Do not we ſee how as the *Primitive Chriſtians* were grievouſly ſlandered, and moſt vehemently hated by the *Heathens*, becauſe of the multiplied villanies of the *Gnoſticks* and other prophane Sects of thoſe times, that profeſſed *Chriſtianity*; ſo true Proteſtants now are obnoxious to thoſe manifold calumnies unjuſtly heaped by the Papiſts and other Sectaries, upon our *Church* and Doctrine, and the whole *Reformation*, becauſe of the ſeditious practices and wicked treacheries of the Presbyterian party, who commonly ſtile themſelves *Proteſtants* and *Reformed*, yea, *Refined Chriſtians*? Nay, I do verily believe, that as the monſtrous wickedneſs

neſs of the aforeſaid *Heroticks* was then a great bar to the timely converſion of the *Idolatrous Pagans*; ſo now the *unchriſtian* proceedings of the presbyterians do mainly obſtruct the *Papiſts* from receiving the true light of the *Goſpel*.

O, but they are our weak Brethren, and we muſt bear their infirmities. Weak Brethren, ſay you? I pray God keep them ſo, and grant they be never ſtronger to ruine our *Church* and *State*, as formerly they have done. Now the *Phariſaical Hypocrites* alledge the weakneſs and tenderneſs of their Conſciences for this *Schiſmatical* diſobedience to their lawful Paſtors, and ſeparation from the *Mother-Church*; though in 48 no tenderneſs of Conſcience could hinder them from murdering their natural *Sovereign* in *England*, and in 79 their onely *Primate* and *Metropolitane* in *Scotland*. *O blind Guides*, (as our Saviour ſaid of the Phariſees) *which ſtrain at a gnat, and ſwallow a camel*, *Matth.* 23. 34. Yet theſe blind Hypocrites you muſt hall in amougſt Epiſcopal Proteſtants, and under the ridiculous name of *diſſenting Brethren*, you endeavour to foſter ſuch *Vipers* in the boſom of our *Church*; a name ſo ſtrange and ſelf-contradictory, as if we had called them our *odious Lovers*, our *loving Enemies*, or the like; for if the Presbyterians obſtinately diſſent from our *Church* in Communion, or matters of Religion, as undoubtedly they do, how can they be our Brethren? or if they be our Brethren in *Religion*, how can they differ from us in Communion, or matters of Faith, which eſſentially is one and individual? for, as the Apoſtle teſtifieth, there is but *one Lord*, *one Faith*, *one Baptiſm*, *Epheſ.* 4. 5.

Ay, but they do not diſſent from us as much as the Papiſts do, not in ſo many, nor in ſo neceſſary points of Religion. But this is to no purpoſe; firſt, becauſe *Heathens* diſſent from us more than *Jews*, *Jews* than *Turks*, and *Turks* than *Papiſts*; yet we muſt embrace neither *Jew*, *Turk*, nor *Papiſt*, for our diſſenting Brethren in *Religion*. Secondly, Becauſe even as it is nothing material whether a man dies of one mortal wound, or of twenty; ſo it skilleth not whether a *Chriſtian* obſtinately errs in one neceſſary point of Religion, or in a dozen. For it is in the Chriſtian Religion, as St. *James* ſaith of the Law, *Whoſoever offendeth in one point, he is guilty of all*, *James* 2. 10. Now it is evident to all the world, that the Presbyterians groſly err in three of the chiefeſt Pillars of *Chriſtian Religion*, as *Charity*, *Unity*, and *Obedience*: It cannot therefore avail them much that they agree with us in ſo many points of the Superſtructure, while they diſagree from us in the very Foundation. Hear what St. *Auguſtin* ſaith of the *Donatiſts* in *Africk*, who much reſemble the *Presbyterians* in *England*; *In many*

things

things (saith he) *they are with me, in few not with me; but in these few wherein they are not with me, the many things wherein they are with me do nothing avail them*; in *Psal.* 54. *ver.* 19. Thirdly because all true *Protestants* acknowledge the Presbyterians are *schismatically* separated from the *Church* of *England*, as well as the Papists; and on the other side, in the *sentiments* of all Learned *Divines*, both antient and modern, *Schism* is so heinous a wickedness, that without repentance and reunion with the *Church* (unless perhaps invincible ignorance may lessen the crime) it wholly excludes the Party from *eternal salvation*, according to the express words of our Saviour, *If he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man, and a Publican*, Matth. 18. 17. *There cannot possibly* (saith St. *Irenæus*) *be made any reformation of such importance, as the mischief of Schism is pernicious*, *lib.* 4. *c.* 62. For (as *Dionysius Alexandrinus* testifieth) *It is a more grievous wickedness to divide the Church, than to sacrifice to Idols*, *ap. Euseb. lib* 6 *hist. c.* 37. Which is yet further affirmed by the Prince of Divines, the great St. *Augustine*, *The sacrilege of Schism* (saith he) *surpasseth all wickedness*, *lib.* 1. *contra ep. Parmen. c.* 4. And lest we should not believe his own single testimony, this assertion he solidly confirms by the fearful punishment inflicted on *Corah*, *Dathan*, and *Abiram*, for their *schismatical* disobedience to *Moses* and *Aaron*. *At what time* (saith he) *God would teach his People by new and fresh punishments to beware of their former transgressions, when an Idol was made and adored*, (Exod. 32.) *when the Prophets book was burnt by the hasty King*, (Jer. 36.) *and the schism was attempted* (Numb. 16.) *by* Corah and his accomplices; *the Idolatry was punished with the sword the burning of the book was revenged with wasting War and forreign Captivity; but the Schism was plagued with the sudden gaping of the earth, the Authors thereof having been swallowed up alive, and consum'd with fire from heaven. Who now* (saith this great Logician) *will doubt, but that was most wickedly committed, which was most grievously punished? lib.* 2. *de Bapt. cont. Donatist. c.* 6.

St. *Cyprian* goeth yet further, and of all *schismatical* Separatists, giveth this general sentence, *Such people, though they were killed in the confession of Christs name, yet that blemish even by blood is not washed away; the unpardonable and grievous crime of dissention is not purged even with death. He cannot be a Martyr that is not in the Church. He cannot attain to the Kingdom, that forsakes her which is to reign. Such an one may be killed, but cannot be crown'd. The enemy of the Altar, rebellious against the Sacrifice of Christ*, despising the Bishops, and forsaking the Priests of God, *presumes to erect another Altar, and make other prayers by his unlawful speeches. Lib. de Unit. Eccles.*

Neither

Neither are our *Modern Divines* leſs plain in this particular; and to begin with *Calvin*, the great God of the Presbyterians, he gives his verdict in theſe following words. *We profeſs the unity of the Church (ſuch as is deſcribed by St.* Paul) *to be moſt dear unto us; and we accurſe them that ſhall any thing violate it*; lib. de neceſs. Reform. Eccleſ. And again, *The Lord doth ſo highly eſteem the Communion of his Church, that he holds him for an Apoſtate, and deſerter of Religion, who inſolently ſeparates himſelf from any Chriſtian Society, ſo it be ſuch a one as hath the true Miniſtry of the Word and Sacraments*; lib. 4. Inſtit. c. 1. §. 10. Either therefore we have not the true Miniſtry of the Word and Sacraments in the Church of *England*, or elſe the Presbyterians are Schiſmaticks, nay Apoſtates and deſerters of Religion, even in the Judgment of their own Patriarch *Calvin*.

Luther likewiſe in his explication upon the *Creed*, ſpeaks to the ſame purpoſe: *Neither* Gentile, *nor* Jew, (ſaith he) *Heretick, or any other ſinner, is ſaved, unleſs he make Atonement with the Church, and in all things think, do, and teach the ſame.* As for our own *Divines*, they are in this point both plain and poſitive: *It is falſe* (ſaith our Learned *Whitaker*) *that Heretical and Schiſmatical Churches, are true Churches.* controv. 2. q. 5. c. 9. And again: *Whereas he proves, that Hereticks, Apoſtates, and Shiſmaticks are not Members of the true Church, it is nothing to us; for this none of us ever affirmed.* controv. 2. q. 1. c. 4.

And Dr. *Fulk* in his Treatiſe of the Succeſſion of the *Church*, p. 390. ſaith: *What ſkilleth it, whether one being drawn by Hereſie or Schiſm from the Body of Chriſt, be ſubject to Eternal Damnation?*

Mr. *Caſaubone* alſo in his Letter to Cardinal *Peron*, written by the appointment of King *James*, page 8. thus ſaith: *The King doth condemn and deteſt thoſe, who departed either from the faith of the Catholick Church, and became Hereticks; or from her Communion, and became Schiſmaticks.* And the ſame is taught by Dr. *Humphrey*, ad rat. 3. Campiani. p. 207. by *Field*, lib. 1. de Eccleſ. c. 7. Confeſs. Helvet. art. 17. Bulling. in compend. fidei. lib. 6. c. 11. Muſculus in Locis, tit. de Schiſmate, p. 621. and many others.

Is it not evident therefore by the unanimous conſent of ſo many *Proteſtant Divines*, ſo exactly concurring with the general vote of the Ancient Writers, and Gods expreſs word, that Schiſm is ſo capital a crime, that it cuts off the party from the *Church* of *God*, and thereby from all ordinary means of obtaining eternal Salvation? And is it not likewiſe certain, that Proteſtants and Presbyterians (notwithſtanding your ridiculous cementing of them together) do mutually cenſure and charge each other with *Schiſm*, if not with impious and *Heretical*

Doctrines. None I think, can be ſo ignorant, as not to know what a Cloud of Writers have given their verdict on both ſides in this particular. To the end therefore you may not hereafter exclaim againſt me, or alledge that I make it my buſineſs to breed diſſention and diviſion between *Proteſtants*, by calling the Presbyterians *Schiſmatical Sectaries*, (tho' indeed it is my deſign to ſeperate the *Wheat* from the *Tares*, true *Proteſtants* from counterfeit *Religionaries*, and warn them not to truſt again ſuch *Hypocritical* Diſſemblers) and that you may be convinc'd, this is no particular opinion of mine, but the general tenet of our Learned *Divines*; hear ſome of them ſpeak their own minds at a time, when Presbytery was not near ſo monſtrous in it ſelf, nor yet half ſo dangerous or formidable to our *Church*, as it is at preſent. *The Puritans* (ſaith Dr. *Bancroft*, *Archbiſhop* of *Canterbury*) *do pervert the true meaning both of Scripture and Fathers, to ſerve their own turns.* In his Survey of the pretended Holy Diſcipline, c. 5. *&c.*

And Mr. *Parkes*, in his book dedicated to the *Archbiſhop*, in his *Epiſtle Dedicatory*, thus ſaith of your holy Brethren: *They are headſtrong, and hardened in error; they ſtrike at the main points of faith, and ſhaking the foundation it ſelf, and calling into queſtion Heaven and Hell, the Divinity and Humanity, yea the very Soul and Salvation of our Saviour himſelf.* And again, ibid. *The Puritans have Peſtilent Hereſies, they are Heretical and Sacrilegious.*

Mr. *Powel* likewiſe, in his Conſiderations, ſaith of them: *They are notorious and manifeſt Schiſmaticks, cut off from the Church of God.*

And this is further confirmed by Mr. *Caſaubons* excellent Rule, (taken out of S. *Cyprian's* 69. Ep.) in Exercit. 15. contra Baron. nu. 6. Where he ſaith: *It is an undoubted verity, that whensoever the pious People adheres to their true and lawfull Biſhop, they are Gods Church, inſomuch that whoſoever ſeperates himſelf from this Congregation, it cannot be doubted, but that he is not in the Church.* Presbyterians therefore are not in the *Church* of God, who have *Schiſmatically* ſeperated themſelves from the pious and orthodox Proteſtants adhering to their true and lawful *Biſhops*. To be brief, the *Biſhop* of *Chicheſter* gives us a full and ſhort deſcription of theſe Holy and Sanctified Bretheren: I *muſt confeſs* (ſaith he) *my diſſent through and ſincere from the faction of Novelizing Puritans; men intractible, inſociable, incompliable with thoſe that will not* ædificare ad diſſenſiones; *but in no one point more, than in their deſperate doctrine of Predeſtination*; in his Appeal to *Cæſar*, page 60. And again p. 320. he ſpeaks to the Presbyterians themſelves in this manner: *I go no farther, but leave you to your ſelves, and* (*if poſſible*)

ſible) unto more charitable conceits of thoſe that deſerve no other imputation, but, they are no Puritans: Which God of his Goodneſs keep out of this Church and State, as dangerous as Popery, for any thing I am able to diſcern: The only difference being, Popery is for Tyranny, Puritaniſm for Anarchy; Popery is original of Superſtition, Puritaniſm the Highway unto Prophaneneſs; both alike Enemies to Piety.

But leſt you ſhould think this learned Prelate any thing tranſported with prejudice or partiality in this his cenſure of your Sanctified Brethren, hear what your own Patriarch and firſt founder ſpeaketh of thoſe, who had the firſt Fruits of his Spirit, his holy Proſelytes at *Geneva*: *It is certain* (ſaith he) *that a man ſhall not ſee ſo horrible monſters in the Papacy, as where the Goſpel is Preach'd and Profeſs'd; for they will ſay they are reformed, and yet they ſeem to be Devils incarnate, neither have we need to go far off to find ſuch ſights.* Calvin ſerm. 10. in ep. ad Epheſ.

Now the Presbyterians on the other ſide are nothing behind in ſlandering and charging the Church of *England* with all imaginable corruption; *Schiſm*, they think, is too ſmall a crime to be alledg'd againſt her, whilſt Popiſh *Superſtition* and the dregs of *Antichriſt* do compoſe the chiefeſt part of her Liturgy, Doctrine and Government. *The form of the Communion-Book* (ſay they) *is taken from the Church of Antichriſt; as the reading of the Epiſtles and Goſpels*, &c. *the moſt of the Prayers, the manner of adminiſtring the Sacraments*, &c. in Dr. *Whitgifts* defence, p. 474. And in their Book intituled, The Petition of 22. Preachers in *London*, they ſay: *In the Communion-Book there be things of which there is no ſenſe, there is contradiction in it, even of neceſſary and eſſential points of Religion.* And alſo in their Book of Cannons and Conſtitutions Eccleſiaſtical, printed *Anno* 1604. they ſay: *The worſhip in the Church of* England *is corrupt, ſuperſtitious, unlawfull and repugnant to the Scriptures.* Likewiſe the great Presbyterian *Alexander Henderſon*, in his firſt *Paper* to our *Royal Martyr*, in the Book intituled *Reliquiæ Carolinæ*, part 1. p. 314. thus ſpeaketh: *It is too well known that the Reformation of* K. Henry 8. *was moſt imperfect in the eſſentials of Doctrine, Worſhip and Government: And though it proceeded by ſome degrees afterwards, yet the Government was never reformed, the head was changed,* Dominus non Dominium, *and the whole limbs of the Antichriſtian Hierarchy retained. And for this cauſe* (as our late *Sovereign* well obſerves) *their zealous Superſtition thinks or pretends, they cannot do God and the Church a greater ſervice, than utterly to deſtroy that Primitive, Apoſtolical, and anciently univerſal Government of the Church by Biſhops*; in his Eikon Baſilike, c. 9. But to conclude, and if *Sy-*